

3.13.'01.

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Purchased by the
Mrs. Robert Lenox Kennedy Church History Fund.

BX 970 .P8 1900
Puller, F. W. 1843-1938.
The primitive saints and the
see of Rome.

THE PRIMITIVE SAINTS

AND

THE SEE OF ROME

THE PRIMITIVE SAINTS

AND

THE SEE OF ROME

BY

F. W. PULLER

OF THE SOCIETY OF S. JOHN THE EVANGELIST, COWLEY

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

EDWARD, LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1900

All rights reserved

TO MY MOST HOLY MOTHER
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
“IN SPITE OF DISASTERS AND MENACING TROUBLES
THE MOST GLORIOUS CHURCH
IN CHRISTENDOM”¹

¹ R. W. Church, D.D., Dean of S. Paul's.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION TO THE THIRD EDITION (1900), BY THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN	xiii
INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EDITION (1893), BY THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN	xvii
AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION (1900)	xxvii
AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION (1893)	xxxi

PART I.

THE POPES HAVE NO DIVINELY GIVEN PRIMACY OF JURISDICTION.

LECTURE I.

THE SEE OF ROME IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.—I.

Introductory—Primitive organization and precedence—The Paschal Controversy—The Irenaeian Passage.

The controversy with Rome a necessity	1
The points to be discussed	3
The Roman claims, as defined at the Vatican Council	<i>ib.</i>
The essential equality of all bishops in early times	5
Two modifying cross-principles—	
(i.) Metropolitan authority and civil precedence	6
(ii.) The influence of the apostolic sees	10
The order of reputed civil precedence governed the situation	11
The position of the Bishop of Rome in ante-Nicene times	13
The Paschal controversy in the time of Victor	14
The witness of S. Irenaeus in regard to the see of Rome	19

LECTURE II.

THE SEE OF ROME IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.—II.

The Theory that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome—The Clementine Romance—S. Cyprian's Witness.

The question of S. Peter's Roman episcopate	36
The Clementine romance and the Petrine legend	41
“The most blessed Pope Cyprian” of Carthage	49
S. Cyprian on the “ecclesia principalis”	50
S. Cyprian denounces appeals to Rome	52
The episode of Marcianus of Arles	55
The episode of Basilides and Martialis	59

	PAGE
The dispute about the baptism of heretics	61
“The harsh obstinacy of our brother Stephen”	64
The excommunication of S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian	67
The Roman Church makes amends	70
<i>Appendix A.—The excommunication of S. Cyprian</i>	72
<i>Appendix B.—Concerning passages from S. Cyprian’s works, which are quoted by Ultramontanes in support of their contention that S. Cyprian held the papal theory</i>	77
<i>Addendum to Appendix B.</i>	91

LECTURE III.

THE RELATION OF S. PETER TO THE APOSTOLIC COLLEGE AND TO THE CHURCH.

Summary of the two previous lectures	96
“Thou art Peter”	97
The varying patristic interpretations of “the rock”	92
S. Augustine’s anti-Donatist ballad	100
S. Augustine’s change of view	101
The true interpretation of “the rock”	105
Leadership not jurisdiction.	108
The witness of Scripture against the Roman theory—	
The mission to Samaria	110
James, Cephas, and John recognized as pillars	111
The president of the Council of Jerusalem	113
Scripture nowhere clearly connects S. Peter with Rome	116
<i>Appendix C.—On our Lord’s words to S. Peter (S. John xxi. 15-17), “Feed My lambs;” “Tend My sheep;” “Feed My sheep”</i>	117

LECTURE IV.

THE GROWTH OF THE PAPAL POWER FROM THE PEACE OF THE CHURCH TO THE END OF THE PONTIFICATE OF DAMASUS.

Summary of the previous lectures.	129
The world admitted within the enclosure of the Church	131
The lowering of the spiritual tone of the clergy.	133
This lowering process traced at Rome during the pontificates of—	
S. Julius	135
Liberius.	<i>ib.</i>
Damasus	136
The Council of Nicaea and the Roman see	137
The Council of Sardica and the Roman see	140
The Emperors make Damasus Patriarch of the West	144
Damasus creates a papal vicariate at Thessalonica	156
The Eustathian schism at Antioch	158
S. Jerome’s letter to Damasus.	161
S. Basil’s letters about Damasus	163
S. Meletius presides over the second Ecumenical Council.	165
He dies out of communion with Rome during the session of the council.	166
<i>Appendix D.—Did the Council of Chalcedon blame Dioscorus for pre- siding over the Latrocinium without papal authoriza- tion? Did Hosius preside at Nicaea as a papal legate?</i>	<i>ib.</i>
<i>Appendix E.—The canons of Sardica and the Eastern Church</i>	172

LECTURE V.

THE GROWTH OF THE PAPAL POWER DURING THE SIXTY YEARS WHICH
FOLLOWED THE DEATH OF DAMASUS.

	PAGE
The effects of the rescripts of Valentinian I. and Gratian	178
Legislative authority exercised through decretal epistles	<i>ib.</i>
“Blessed Peter lives and judges in his successors”	181
Resistance in the West to the new State-created patriarchal yoke	183
The case of Apiarius of Sicca	<i>ib.</i>
The Councils of Carthage in 418 and 419	184
The African letter (<i>Quoniam Domino</i>) to Pope Boniface	186
Pope Celestine receives Apiarius to communion after his second condemna- tion.	190
The African letter (<i>Optaremus</i>) to Pope Celestine	<i>ib.</i>
The case of Anthony of Fussala	194
The case of S. Hilary of Arles	196
The rescript of Valentinian III.	200
Concluding remarks on the later developments of the papal power	202
<i>Appendix F.—On the genuineness of the Letter Optaremus, addressed by a Carthaginian council (circa 426) to Pope Celestine</i>	
	204

PART II.

COMMUNION WITH THE ROMAN SEE IS NOT A NECESSARY
CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

LECTURE VI.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

Summary of the preceding lectures	215
Cardinal Wiseman's statement.	216
The Roman theory of unity	<i>ib.</i>
Contrast between the Catholic doctrine and the Roman theory	217
The testimony of Holy Scripture in favour of the Catholic doctrine— The analogy between Israel and the Church	219
Our Lord's prayer for unity at the Last Supper	222
Transition to the testimony of the Fathers	224
The action of the Catholic episcopate in the time of Pope Victor	<i>ib.</i>
The witness of S. Cyprian and of S. Firmilian	225

LECTURE VII.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME
IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—I.*The thirty years of promiscuous communion in the East,
A.D. 331 to A.D. 361.*

The Antiochene Catholics remain in communion with their Arianizing bishops	227
The Eustathians break away	228
The East and the West cease to communicate together after the Council of Sardica	229
Two attempts to restore peace— (1) in A.D. 345	232
(2) in A.D. 352	233

	PAGE
Promiscuous communion between the orthodox and the Arians in the East	235
The middle party in the Eastern Church	<i>ib.</i>
Some of the Saints who belonged to that party—	
S. Cyril of Jerusalem	237
S. Basil the Great	238
S. Eusebius of Samosata	240
S. Meletius of Antioch	241
S. Meletius' consecration to the see of Sebaste in 357	<i>ib.</i>
His election to the see of Antioch in 361	245
His orthodoxy	247
His sermon preached in the presence of the Emperor	254
The Arian, Euzoïus, is intruded into his see	255

LECTURE VIII.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME
IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—II.

The Council of Alexandria, held in 362.

The accession of Julian the Apostate brings relief to the Church	258
The proceedings of the Council of Alexandria	259
The programme of the council for the healing of the Antiochene schism	261
Lucifer consecrates Paulinus	264
The general pacification of the Church in 362, the work of S. Athanasius rather than of Liberius	265
S. Athanasius reconciles the penitent Liberius	272
Liberius after his reconciliation helps forward the work of pacification initiated by S. Athanasius	<i>ib.</i>
The leadership of Rome is not a vital element in the Church's constitution	274
<i>Appendix G.—On Sozomen's account of Liberius' fall</i>	<i>275</i>
<i>Addendum to Appendix G.</i>	<i>287</i>

LECTURE IX.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME
IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—III.

From the death of Julian to the death of Valens (363-378).

S. Meletius refuses to communicate with S. Athanasius	288
S. Athanasius then re-admits the Eustathians to his communion	289
S. Meletius at the Council of Antioch accepts the Nicene terminology	291
Liberius admits the Semi-Arians to his communion	293
Dorotheus' first mission to the West	297
The Council of Rome (December, 371)	299
The Easterns send a second letter to the West by Sabinus	301
Damasus returns this letter, unanswered, by the hands of Evagrius	303
The Easterns send a third letter to the West by Dorotheus and Sanctissimus	305
The Council of Rome, held in the summer of 374	307
Vitalis joins the Apollinarians	308
S. Jerome writes to Damasus in 375 from the desert of Chalcis	311
Vitalis goes to Rome, and tries to get himself recognized	314
Damasus sends letters of communion to Paulinus	315
S. Basil holds that Damasus "has defrauded of his due the bishop of the true Church of God, Meletius"	321
S. Basil continues to communicate with S. Meletius, and to reject Paulinus	322
The Easterns send a fourth letter to the West by Dorotheus and Sanctissimus	324
The Council of Rome, held in 376 or 377	326
The end of the Arian persecution in the East	328

LECTURE X.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME
IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—IV.*The Compact between S. Meletius and Paulinus.*

	PAGE
The Council of Antioch in 379 sends letters to Rome	329
The Council of Rome in 380 implies that S. Meletius is still outside the communion of the West	330
The Emperor Theodosius' laws in favour of the Nicene faith	334
Sapor decides that the churches at Antioch shall be handed over to S. Meletius, and not to either Paulinus or Vitalis	336
S. Meletius and Paulinus make a compact in February or March, 381	339
The nature of the compact.	340
S. Meletius' embassy to the West	342
The compact is provisionally ratified by the bishops of the province of Milan	344
But S. Meletius still remains outside the communion of the West	347
S. Meletius dies outside the Roman communion	350
Summary account of S. Meletius' history and status	<i>ib.</i>
<i>Appendix H.—On the way in which it came to pass that the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 was finally recognized by the whole Church as an Ecumenical Council</i>	<i>353</i>

LECTURE XI.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME
IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—V.*The Episcopate of S. Flavian.*

The Eastern bishops refuse to ratify the compact	362
S. Flavian succeeds to the throne of Antioch	364
S. Flavian's consecrators excommunicated by Damasus	365
S. Chrysostom out of communion with Rome till he was fifty-one or perhaps fifty-four years old	<i>ib.</i>
S. Chrysostom's veneration for S. Flavian	366
The uncanonical consecration of Evagrius	367
S. Chrysostom warns those who go over to the Roman communion of the wickedness of that proceeding	368
S. Chrysostom and S. Flavian enter into communion with Rome on their own terms	371
<i>Appendix I.—S. Chrysostom's view of S. Peter's position in connexion with the election of S. Matthias to the apostolate</i>	<i>372</i>

LECTURE XII.

THE ACACIAN TROUBLES

The growth of the power of the Roman see after the rescript of Valentinian III.	376
The quarrel with Acacius	377
Felix III. deposes and excommunicates Acacius	379
The invalidity of this act	<i>ib.</i>
The spurious clause alleged, as from a Nicene canon, in its defence	381
The completeness of the breach between Rome and the East	383
Felix refuses to communicate with Euphemius	384
The description of the situation by Cyril of Scythopolis	386

	PAGE
The Eastern saints during the schism—	
S. Elias of Jerusalem	387
S. Macedonius of Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>
Catalogue of other Eastern saints who lived during the schism	388
Notes on these saints	390
The importance of their testimony	396
How the Acacian troubles came to an end—	
Justin succeeds to Anastasius	<i>ib.</i>
The day of the great acclamations	397
The <i>libellus</i> of Pope Hormisdas	398
The Patriarch John's preamble to the <i>libellus</i>	400
The majority of the Eastern bishops refuse to sign	401
Pope Hormisdas waives his <i>libellus</i> , and peace ensues	402
Father Bottalla's extraordinary account of this episode	<i>ib.</i>
The witness of the East against the papal theory	403
The African Church excommunicates Pope Vigilius	404
S. Mennas of Constantinople also excommunicates him	<i>ib.</i>
S. Eutychius and the Fifth Ecumenical Council act in defiance of his wishes	<i>ib.</i>
The pope confesses that the devil had deceived him, and retracts	405
The saints of Como, who were never in communion with Rome	<i>ib.</i>
S. Columbanus justifies the bishops who refused to communicate with Rome	<i>ib.</i>
The true conditions of Catholic communion	406
Christ the only Head of the Church	<i>ib.</i>
The certainty of the Church's ultimate re-union	408
<i>Appendix J.—On the completeness of the breach of communion between the East and the West during the period of the Acacian troubles</i>	<i>409</i>
<i>Addendum to Appendix J.</i>	<i>414</i>
<i>Appendix K.—The 350 Martyrs of Syria Secunda</i>	<i>418</i>
<i>Appendix L.—On the fact that many of the Oriental bishops were admitted to the communion of Hormisdas without signing his libellus</i>	<i>421</i>
<i>Appendix M.—On the Principle of Development</i>	<i>424</i>
ADDITIONAL NOTES	434

EXCURSUS I.

<i>On the date of the Roman Council which petitioned Gratian on the subject of the trial of bishops in the letter Et hoc Glorie Vestrae</i>	510
---	-----

EXCURSUS II.

<i>On certain facts and dates connected with the proceedings of Maximus the Cynic in North Italy, which corroborate the conclusion that a council of the province of Milan was held in May, or thereabouts, in the year 381</i>	529
---	-----

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF ECCLESIASTICAL EVENTS BELONGING TO THE YEARS 381 AND 382	541
CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE COUNCILS TO WHICH REFERENCE IS MADE IN THIS VOLUME	542
CATALOGUE OF THE NAMES OF THE BISHOPS OF ROME DURING THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES AFTER CHRIST	545
INDEX	547

INTRODUCTION TO THE THIRD EDITION (1900)

BY THE LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN

I HAVE been asked by my dear and learned friend, Father Puller, to write a short letter by way of Introduction to the new edition of his excellent book, *the Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*.

I am very glad to know that the book has been so much approved that a third edition is asked for.

There is no real need for any commendatory letter from me. Father Puller's accurate learning and his fearless honesty in argument are sufficient to commend all that he writes. Nevertheless, as I wrote a short Preface to the first edition, and some considerable additions have been made to the book, it was desired that I should see what the additions are, in order that the original Preface, if possible, might stand.

The additions in the new edition are considerable, and show a great amount of careful work, including replies to such criticisms on the two earlier editions as had naturally come from Roman sources. But there is no change in the line of argument, or in the conclusion. The additions consist principally of certain new Lectures with Appendices, and a large number of explanatory notes. Attention may be specially called to Appendix M, which deals with "The Principle of Development."

The new Lectures are the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th, with their Appendices.

Some few portions of the other Lectures have been re-written.

Thus the book remains substantially the same in its incontrovertible excellence.

It is sad to dwell upon any period of controversy, in which the Church has been engaged; but one can hardly look back again on the condition of Christendom in the fourth century without a feeling of thankfulness and renewed confidence, when one considers the divisions and suspicions and almost hopeless confusion, through which the Holy Spirit has led the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and has preserved her amongst us to the present time. The dangers arising from the teaching of Arius, Marcellus, Macedonius, and Apollinarius were vital; and even the new word *ὁμοούσιον*, though the safeguard of orthodoxy, was not introduced without suspicions of Sabellian tendencies.

The disputes and anxieties connected with the history of S. Meletius were not of so fundamental a kind; but for that very reason the history of that holy Bishop is the more apposite to the recent claims of universal jurisdiction made by the Roman See. For this reason a considerable part of the added Lectures is devoted to a yet further investigation of the Meletian controversy. Dr. Bright has stated the case with his usual clearness and strength: "For here lay the pith of the whole question; while they both lived, was Meletius, or was Paulinus, the rightful occupant of the See? Rome had consistently upheld Paulinus; if he was the true Bishop, Meletius was, *pro tanto*, in schism; when did Rome change her mind as between these two claimants? There is no evidence of any such change; and there is clear evidence to the contrary."¹ And this is the S. Meletius, the friend of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom, whose history Father Puller sums up in the following words:—"He died, as he had lived, outside the communion of Rome. He died president of a Council which the Church venerates as ecumenical. And one may say with truth that from the day of his death, the Catholic East, and from some later date the Catholic West, have honoured him as a hero of sanctity and orthodoxy. His name has been inscribed both in the East and in the West on the roll of the canonized Saints."² Could any

¹ *The Roman See in the Early Church*, by Dr. Bright, p. 108.

² p. 350.

history show more completely that the early Church knew nothing of the modern Roman claim of universal jurisdiction?

The facts of history being as they are, it was a clever attempt to remove the difficulty by suggesting the theory of Development: a theory which may be true enough in the domain of discipline and theological science, but not in the domain of "obligatory dogma." "In the Nicene definition there was no development of the substance of the Apostolic faith, though there was a development in regard to its expression."¹ The same is true of all the great councils of the Church. New words may have obtained new value, but it was because they expressed the old faith, and excluded the accretions of new heresies. The theory of Development, like many other clever theories, is attractive, and has a certain amount of force; but when applied to the supposition which underlies the modern Roman claims of ecumenical jurisdiction, that supposition being enforced as an "obligatory dogma," the theory fails to satisfy, suggesting assumption and not truth. Bishop Lightfoot says:—"The claims of Rome in this early age were modest indeed compared with her later assumptions. It is an enormous stride from the supremacy of Gregory the Great to the practical despotism claimed by Hildebrand and Innocent III. in the eleventh and succeeding centuries, as it is again a still vaster stride from the latter to the absolute infallibility of Pius IX. in the nineteenth century."² The theory has indeed never been formally adopted by the Roman Church, and therefore, perhaps, enough has been said, if it has been shown to be deceptive and untrue in certain applications.

These few prefatory words are quite inadequate to convey any idea of the amount of careful labour that has been bestowed on this larger edition of Father Puller's work. The book should be read carefully, with its notes and appendices, and then it will, I believe, repay the student by giving him an exact knowledge of a most critical period of Church History, and a true representation of the mind of the early Church in the matter of the relation of the See of Rome to the other Sees of Catholic Christendom.

¹ p. 426.

² *Leaders in the Northern Church*, p. 51, quoted on p. 371 of this volume.

It is hardly necessary to add that the new edition is pervaded by the same spirit of brilliant, fearless love, in the confidence that there is no greater kindness than to bring a brother to the truth, and that the truth is the only sure basis of that unity which love desires. With this object the book is again put forth, together with the earnest prayer that it may please God "to inspire continually the Universal Church with the Spirit of truth, unity, and concord."

E. LINCOLN.

Whit-Monday, 1900.

INTRODUCTION¹ TO THE FIRST EDITION (1893)

BY THE LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN

I REMEMBER seeing, some few years ago, in Dr. Pusey's own handwriting, a letter written in answer to a friend who had asked him to recommend the most important works in refutation of the Socinian heresy.

Dr. Pusey's answer was to this effect—that such a question would indeed admit of an answer of considerable length, but for himself he had always considered the first fourteen verses of the first chapter of S. John's Gospel to be quite sufficient.

The title of this book, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, has reminded me of this incident.

The way of the truth is one: the paths of error are many, and in many of them there is much to be seen that is attractive, and for a time pleasant; but in the end they do not satisfy, not leading us to that perfect rest of head and heart which is only to be found in the way of truth.

In the writings of the Primitive Church, we do not see at once how many possible errors are excluded and refuted by them until we have the later distortions and confusions of the faith brought before us. When these later errors are placed beside the rule of the one faith, the fact of their variation, and the degree of it, become apparent.

Hence, as new forms of error spring up, it is necessary to look again at the one rule of the faith, that we may not be deceived. This is the object of the present book. The Fathers of the first four centuries are so unconscious of the

[¹ In the first two editions of this book the Bishop of Lincoln's introductory commendation bore the title of *Preface*. To avoid confusion, it now bears the title of *Introduction*.—(July, 1900).]

claims made by the Roman Church at the present time, and in the Middle Ages, in the matter of jurisdiction, that a reader of those early writings would not think of collecting the accumulative evidence on the subject which they afford until the modern claims had been pressed upon him. For this reason Father Puller at once states the position which he holds to be inconsistent with the teaching of the great writers of the earlier centuries, by quotations of Roman documents of the highest authority. He begins with the dogmatic definition of Pope Boniface VIII. in his bull, *Unam Sanctam*:¹—"We therefore declare, assert, and define that for every human creature it is altogether necessary to salvation that he be subject to the Roman pontiff." Afterwards² he cites from the decrees of the Vatican Council of the year 1870 that "the Roman Church, by the appointment of the Lord, holds the chief authority of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction belonging to the Roman pontiff is a truly episcopal power," and "an immediate power." Further, that all the pastors and all the faithful, whether taken separately or taken altogether, are bound to the authority of the pope "by the obligation of true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in things pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world." It is added that "this is the teaching of the Catholic faith, and that no one can deviate from it without the loss of faith and salvation."

Such assumptions are so contradictory to the honest interpretation of the writings and acts of the Church of the first centuries, that it is difficult to see how they could ever be made, except through ignorance or the blinding influence of ambition.

Bishop Butler has remarked that "people are too apt inconsiderately to take for granted that things are really questionable, because they hear them often disputed. This," he says, "is so far from being a consequence, that we know demonstrated truths have been disputed, and even matters of fact, the objects of our senses."³

¹ pp. 1, 2.

² pp. 3, 4.

³ *Charge to the Clergy of Durham*, 1751, p. 310. Oxford Edition, 1850.

It would seem as if the converse of this principle were also true, and that people are too apt inconsiderately to take for granted that what is confidently asserted must necessarily be true. Some false principle of this kind has, we feel sure, unconsciously it may be, induced many minds to yield assent to the constant repetition of the groundless assumptions of the modern Roman claims with regard to jurisdiction. We have long been convinced that the modern Roman Church has unduly magnified the question of jurisdiction, and has endeavoured to clothe it with a degree of mystery and terror which it does not possess.

The chief practical factor in jurisdiction is really negative, and is based on human considerations with a view to the preservation of order, and as a safeguard against the human infirmities of ambition and the love of power, in the exercise of the truly mysterious powers conveyed by ordination and consecration. So Bishop Wordsworth says, "The episcopal office is of divine institution, and cannot, in its spiritual nature and ministrations, be affected by any human laws; the actual *exercise* of *authority* of bishops as diocesans, metropolitans, and patriarchs, may depend for its distribution and apportionment upon secular circumstances, and be subject to modifications from civil authority after ecclesiastical consultation."¹ And so Father Puller has expressed his own belief. "To sum up this part of our subject. By divine right all bishops were inherently equal, but by custom and ecclesiastical legislation the bishops of the metropolitanical sees acquired certain rights which were delegated to them by their brother bishops. Moreover, among the most important Churches a certain order of precedence grew up, which corresponded with the civil dignity of the cities in which those Churches existed; and, finally, the Churches which were founded by the apostles were treated with peculiar reverence."²

In his Epistle to the Romans, S. Paul, more than once, leaves the particular point in dispute, and recalls those to whom he is writing to the consideration of some first principle, or generally accepted truth, by which in reality the point at

¹ *Theophilus Anglicanus*, pt. i. ch. xii., p. 117, 2nd edit.

² p. 11.

issue was governed. "God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world?"¹ or, "Nay; but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?"²

Some method of this kind is what is wanted in dealing with the modern Roman claims. Instead of allowing the mind to be unduly biassed by the supposed interpretation of particular passages, it should be recalled to make an honest judgement on the general object and meaning of the writer from whose works the passage in question is taken. Is it possible, we would ask, that the great Fathers of the early centuries could have commented as they did upon the great Petrine texts, "On this rock I will build My Church," and "Feed My sheep," if they had seen in them authority for asserting the vital necessity of obedience to S. Peter and to his successors in the particular see of Rome?

Can we conceive that S. Irenaeus or S. Cyprian could have written and acted as they did if they had regarded the Bishop of Rome as the infallible and supreme authority over the whole Church?

Could the Fathers of the Council of Nicaea have passed the canons which we know they passed if they had recognized the papal supremacy? We need to bring our minds to the consideration of such words as Dr. Bright has given us in his notes on the sixth canon of Nicaea: "The omission (of a saving clause acknowledging the unique and sovereign position of the Bishop of Rome) is a proof, if proof were wanted, that the First Œcumenical Council knew nothing of the doctrine of papal supremacy."³

These simple primary facts are of great importance, for we must remember that the last word has by no means yet been spoken with regard to the mediaeval and modern claims of Rome.

Only, alas! about one-third of the world is as yet Christian, even in name. The great world of India and China, as it becomes acquainted with the history of the Church, must make up its mind upon these assumptions. It is of the utmost importance that we should present the truth to the

¹ iii. 6.

² ix. 20.

³ *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils*, by W. Bright, D.D., p. 21. Oxford: 1882.

independently educated Heathen mind in the most exact and strongest form possible. The great Eastern Church rejects those claims with unshaken confidence. The intellectual Protestant world in Europe resents them. With ourselves in England, the increased knowledge of history is enabling us to see with increasing clearness the human origin out of which many of those ecclesiastical claims have sprung, and the human infirmities which have supported and developed them. The increased study of history in our universities is a marked feature of the last fifty years. Formerly, the requirements of candidates for ordination, with regard to Church history, were limited, almost exclusively, to a knowledge of the first three or four centuries, and of the Reformation, which left them in blank ignorance of the very thousand years in which the claims of the papacy grew up. This ignorance on our part gave a great opportunity for the strong assertions of the advocates of the Roman claims. Now the study of mediæval history has enabled us to appreciate more fully the truth of the quotation with which the late learned Archbishop of Dublin concludes his lecture on "The papacy at its height" in the time of Innocent III., when he speaks of it as "the grandest and most magnificent failure in human history."¹ Father Puller has brought out very clearly² how much in the Roman claims to jurisdiction may be traced to the merely human source of the Rescript of Gratian, towards the close of the fourth century. Yet "the new system," he adds, "applies only to the West." "There is not a word in the Rescript about the Eastern empire." "It is limited, local;" "patriarchal, not papal." And the patriarchal jurisdiction over Gaul, Britain, Spain, and Africa "was the creation of the State, not of the Church."³ The same is true of the Rescript of Valentinian III., which formed a new starting-point in the development of the papal power.⁴

Viewed in connection with the persistency of the Roman

¹ *Mediæval Church History*, by Archbishop Trench, p. 162. 1877.

² pp. 144-156.

[³ The quotations in the text are cited from a section of the book which has been much altered and enlarged in this new edition. The expressions quoted do not now find a place in this volume. However, what they set forth is perfectly true; and the substance of the last quotation, though not the actual words, will be found on p. 155.—(July, 1900).]

⁴ pp. 212-215.

assumptions generally, the failure of the repeated attacks of Roman writers upon the validity of Anglican orders is very encouraging. Nothing could have been stronger than the assertions which have been made. The historical facts of the consecration of Parker and of Barlow have been disputed, but no candid weigher of historical evidence would now doubt them. The validity of the form used in ordination and consecration has been denied, but the better liturgiologists of the Roman communion have shown that such denial would be suicidal. Attempts have been made to hang the weight of the validity of our orders upon the subtle thread of *intention*, but here in truth we agree; "*Intentio faciendi id quod facit Ecclesia, quod Christus instituit*," we heartily accept.¹ Indeed, one of the latest writers against Anglican orders has honestly admitted that "it is very unfortunate that the Nag's Head story was ever seriously put forward; for it is so absurd, on the face of it, that it has led to the suspicion of Catholic theologians not being sincere in the objections they make to Anglican orders."² Quite so. And this compels us to mention what we would willingly, if sorrowfully, pass over in silence—the worse than merely human element on which much of the Roman claims are based; the false documents, the forgeries; and the unaccountable false use of true documents, such as the quotation of the fifth canon of the Council of Sardica by the Roman legates at the Council of Carthage as a canon of the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea. "The Council of Nicaea was venerated in Africa, as elsewhere, and its canons received as authoritative." But "when the legates quoted the Sardican canon as if it were Nicene, the African bishops at Carthage must have been thoroughly puzzled. They thought that they knew the Nicene canons well, and

¹ Cf. Hooker (*Eccles. Pol.* v. lviii. 3): "Inasmuch as sacraments are actions religious and mystical, which nature they have not unless they proceed from a serious meaning, and what every man's private mind is, as we cannot know, so neither are we bound to examine, therefore always in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice, and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume that he which outwardly doth the work, hath inwardly the purpose of the Church of God;" and see *Elementa Theol. Dogm.*, vol. vii. p. 135. Schouppé, S.J. 1870. "Non requiritur intentio faciendi id quod facit Ecclesia Romana; sed sufficit intentio generalis faciendi quod facit Ecclesia."

² *The Question of Anglican Orders Discussed*, by the Very Reverend T. H. Estcourt, M.A., F.S.A., Canon of St. Chad's, Birmingham, p. 154. 1873.

this canon quoted by the legates which allowed appeals to Rome, was completely new to them.”¹ The whole case of Apiarius is most instructive. We may compare with it the false quotation, as from the sixth canon of Nicaea, which was made by the Roman legate Paschasinus at the Council of Chalcedon.²

There is perhaps an element of comfort to be derived from the recognition of the existence of these forgeries. On the one hand, it frees us from the necessity of any longer straining our minds to account for facts which appear in all honesty so unaccountable. On the other, it may mitigate the moral responsibility of those who have honestly based their words and actions upon them, believing them to be genuine. It is, for example, hard to understand how any one familiar with the writings of S. Irenaeus, could speak of S. Peter as the first bishop³ of the Roman see. The anti-Pauline Clementine romance may explain the source from which this invention was derived.⁴ The interpolations in the writings of S. Cyprian, the supposed decretals of the early popes, given in Isidore's decretals, and woven into the *Decretum* of Gratian and the later canon law, and into the theological system of the schoolmen,—all these, and other like inventions, have had much to do with building up the papal system, and have given confidence to the modern assumption of universal jurisdiction.

It is much to be wished that the writings of the schoolmen, as a whole, should be seriously taken in hand by a competent body of scholars, so that they might be thoroughly edited, and the statements contained in them tested by the knowledge which we now possess. A valuable residuum would, I have no doubt, remain in all the branches of scientific knowledge; but it would be a *residuum*. Not all their assertions could be accepted. The same is to be wished with regard to canon law. The contributions which have been made by Von Schulte⁵ and others ought to be attended to and followed up.

¹ See p. 185.

² See Dr. Bright's *Notes* (as before), p. 198.

[³ Two words in this sentence, which needed to be corrected, have been altered. —(July, 1900).]

⁴ See pp. 41-49.

⁵ *Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des Canonischen Rechts, . . . von Dr. Joh. F. von Schulte.* 1875.

Hitherto Roman writers have too often made their assertions, and then retired into the dark places of the schoolmen and the canon law, as into a wood; and we, from ignorance, have been afraid to follow them. The whole ground wants clearing, and sowing with the good seed of the truth.

But this is perhaps travelling beyond the limits of the present volume, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*.

The book should be studied carefully, in order that the contrast between the modern Roman claims and the teaching of the primitive saints may be seen in detail, and the importance of the contrast may be fully appreciated.

The latter part is chiefly occupied with the contravention of the Roman position, as expressed by Cardinal Wiseman: "According to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic, and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the see of Rome and who are not."¹

The impossibility of accepting this statement is very fully and ably shown from the history of S. Meletius, S. Flavian, S. Chrysostom, and many others, who during their lifetime were the recognized leaders and champions of the Church, and who were reckoned among the saints after their death, though their lives were lived, in part or altogether, out of communion with the see of Rome.²

While the historical force of the book cannot be felt without a careful study of its contents, there is one element of power which it possesses for which I cannot refrain from expressing my most sincere thanks: I mean the brilliancy of the Christian spirit which runs through it all. This is in a measure a new and a most powerful factor in our controversy with Rome. The self-devotion and zeal of many in the Roman communion have been a great weight in the scale when the mind has become weary of arguing. The ἠθικὴ

¹ p. 216.

² "S. Meletius, even while president of this second General Council, was still out of communion with the West" (*The Councils of the Church from A.D. 51 to A.D. 381*, by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., p. 306. J. H. Parker. 1857).

"S. Hilary died on May 5, at the age of forty-eight. He was, like Meletius, a man of acknowledged sanctity outside the Roman communion" (*History of the Church from A.D. 313 to 451*, by W. Bright, p. 389. Parker. 1860).

πίστις has a persuasive force of great and deserved value. It partakes of the mysterious power of personal influence, and is the result, not of mere intellectual cleverness, but of character and life.

A light of new brilliancy seems to be thrown on these old records, as they are represented to us by one who has voluntarily renounced those worldly comforts and advantages which most of us in the Church of England have claimed it to be our rightful liberty to enjoy. Nothing but the pure desire to state the truth, that so the light and life and love which belong to the Body of Christ, by virtue of her union with her Divine Head, might be with us in their fullest perfection, could have induced this author to write a book of controversy.

It is this perfect charity and chivalrous confidence in the truth, through the power of the Holy Spirit, which gives us new hope that, in God's good time, Wisdom will be justified of her children ; and that, as we are each and all indwelt by the Holy Spirit in greater fulness, we shall be taught by the same Spirit to speak the truth in love, and to "grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."¹

So may the Saviour's prayer be fulfilled, "that they may be one even as We are One."²

EDWARD LINCOLN.

¹ Eph. iv. 15, 16.

² S. John xvii. 22.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION (1900)

IN preparing this new and very much enlarged edition of *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, I have adhered strictly to the line of argument which I followed in the two earlier editions. But I have taken into account the criticisms which those earlier editions have called forth, and have also made serious efforts to profit by the opportunities for thought and study which have been granted to me. I hope that the result has been to strengthen very materially the force of my argument against the papal claims.

Those claims either rest on a most fundamental part of the revelation which God has been pleased to make to His people, or else they must be rejected by Catholic believers, and by Christians generally, as embodying a grievous perversion of the truth. The papal theory is too tremendous, too far-reaching in its results, too peremptorily pressed by those who believe in it, and too widely prevalent, both in the middle ages and in modern times, for it to be safe or wise to ignore it. It is a thing which has to be faced, and either accepted or rejected. If we deliberately accept it, it becomes our duty to seek to be admitted to the communion of the Roman pontiff on the terms which he lays down. If we reject it, very many results affecting both faith and practice follow; and to me, at least, it presents itself as a duty to set forth in print some of the reasons which compel me to reject it, in order that, if God blesses my endeavour, I may strengthen others in a similar rejection.

Since the publication of the first edition in May, 1893, my book has been reviewed by most of the English Roman Catholic newspapers, magazines, and reviews, and it has also been criticized at great length by the late Dr. Luke Rivington in a large volume entitled *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter*. I have carefully considered the arguments of my

Roman Catholic critics, and have honestly tried to do justice to whatever solid reasoning they might seem to contain. In some few cases I have been led to change my view of the meaning of this or that passage; but the general impression which these criticisms have left upon my mind is, that it is quite hopeless to defend the papal claims by an appeal to the Fathers and to the history of the early Church.

In this new edition I have done my best to reply to all such criticisms as seemed of sufficient importance to be noticed in a book which was not to exceed the limits of a single octavo volume.

It is a cause of great sorrow to me that Dr. Rivington, whose name occurs so frequently in the chapters which follow, should, in the Providence of God, have passed into the unseen world before he was able to read what I had to say in answer to his arguments. There is something distasteful in keeping up a contest with one who is no longer here to reply. However, his treatise is by far the most elaborate defence of the papal claims which has appeared of late years in English; and his book remains, though he has been taken away. I have felt, therefore, that it was necessary to leave intact the passages in which his arguments are criticized. I hope that, in the clearer light of the other world, he will rejoice if I am able in any way to contribute to the victory of truth.

It is, on the other hand, a real consolation to me that, however much his conclusions may have differed from mine, Dr. Rivington felt the need of establishing and commending what he believed to be true in regard to the polity of the Church, by appealing to the witness of Christian antiquity. There are people who appear to think that the witness of Christian antiquity, for or against such an institution as the papacy, is a matter of no great importance. According to their view it would seem that the Church is at liberty to develop new forms of ecclesiastical polity, and to impose them under pain of anathema, as binding the faithful *jure divino*, and generally to proceed as if her post-apostolic acts of legislation could be regarded as equivalent to the appointment of our Lord Himself. With persons, who hold such a view as this, it would be quite useless for me to argue on such

a subject as the papal claims; we should differ too completely in regard to first principles. Happily, the Roman Church herself in her dogmatic definitions, in the bulls of her popes, and in the writings of her great theologians repudiates altogether any such monstrous theory. Pope Leo XIII., when commending for acceptance the definitions promulgated by his predecessor, expressly assures us that "in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the Roman pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age."¹ That is a line of argument which I can thoroughly appreciate. If the pope's statement were really true, I should be ready at once to proclaim my adhesion to the Vatican decree. But those, who defend the papal claims by appealing to a vague principle of development,² cut themselves off from the tradition and authoritative teaching of their own Church, and are not likely to make much impression on Catholics of the Church of England, who have been rightly instructed in their religion.

I pass on to say a few words about the changes and additions which have been made in this new edition of my book. The amount of printed matter is considerably more than twice as large as in the earlier editions. The sections dealing with the Irenaeus passage, with the Clementine romance, and with the rescript of Gratian, have been almost entirely re-written; and the other sections of the book have been carefully revised and corrected. New appendices³ have been added, dealing with such subjects as "Papal presidency at General Councils," "The canons of Sardica and the Eastern Church," "The genuineness of the Carthaginian letter addressed to Pope Celestine," "Sozomen's account of Liberius' fall," "The history of the recognition of the ecumenicity of the Second Council," "The completeness of the breach between East and West during the Acacian troubles," and others. In two Excursuses I hope that I have

¹ See the passage quoted with references on p. 433.

² A short discussion of the principle of Development will be found in Appendix M (pp. 424-433).

³ The seven long Notes, which formed the Appendix of the book in the earlier editions, have been re-printed, after revision, in this edition. Five of them appear as Appendices, and the two others will be found among the Additional Notes.

succeeded in throwing light on the chronology of some of the Roman councils under Damasus, and of some of the Milanese councils under S. Ambrose. There is also a large body of Additional Notes, intended to elucidate or to justify statements made in the text of the book. But perhaps the most important addition of all is a series of five new lectures, in which I have attempted to set forth the history of the relations of the Church of Antioch, and of the Eastern Church generally, to the Church of Rome during the years which elapsed between A.D. 330 and A.D. 398.

I must again express my gratitude to the Bishop of Lincoln, who has taken the trouble to read the new parts of my book, and has prefixed to his original Introduction a new Introduction, referring to this enlarged edition. I know well that I do not deserve what he says of me, but it is a great encouragement to be able to publish the results of my labour of revision under the shelter of his commendation.

I wish also to thank my friend, the Rev. F. E. Brightman, of the Pusey House, for most kindly undertaking to read the greater part of the book, first in manuscript and afterwards in proof, and for making several valuable suggestions and corrections.

My thanks are also due to many other friends who have helped me in various ways. Among them I must specially mention Mr. C. H. Turner, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, who read over the two chronological Excursuses in manuscript, and who has suggested to me two ingenious, and, in my opinion, satisfactory emendations of the text of the synodical letter *Sanctum animum tuum*.¹

And now I commend my book to the great Head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, beseeching Him to bring to nought whatever in it may be contrary to His mind, and humbly hoping that He will accept it in its main purport and intention, and will use it to His own glory and to the promotion of the peace and unity of His people.

F. W. P.

THE MISSION HOUSE, COWLEY S. JOHN, OXFORD,
July 6, 1900.

¹ See pp. 532, 537.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION (1893)

THE first five lectures printed in this volume were delivered in the Church of All Hallows-on-the-Wall, in the city of London, to an audience consisting of clergymen, working for the most part in the parishes of London and its suburbs. They were delivered at the request of an association of East End incumbents, which is known by the name of "Our Society," on five consecutive Thursday mornings in Lent, 1892. These five lectures deal with the claim to a supremacy or primacy of jurisdiction, as of divine right, which is made on behalf of the Roman pontiffs. The two remaining lectures ¹ have been written subsequently, and deal with the theory that communion with the see of Rome is the necessary condition of communion with the Catholic Church.

I have not thought it necessary to devote any lecture to the consideration of the crowning claim of the papacy to doctrinal infallibility, because, if I am not mistaken, this claim to infallibility is usually set forth as a consequence logically involved in the doctrine that the pope has a primacy of jurisdiction, and that he is the necessary centre of communion.² I have preferred to deal with these two more fundamental claims. If they can be shown to be unwarranted, it will evidently follow that the logical superstructure which has been built upon them is baseless.

I wish particularly to call attention to the fact that, in dealing with the historical argument against the papal claims, I have not attempted to cover the whole ground, even within the limits of the first six centuries, beyond which period I

¹ [In this enlarged edition the two additional lectures mentioned in the text have expanded into seven lectures.—(July, 1900).]

² Compare Bottalla, *The Infallibility of the Pope*, pp. 3, 4.

do not profess to go. If I had made any such attempt, this book would have become so voluminous, that it would probably have secured very few readers, and the object which I had in view, when I undertook to prepare it, would be defeated. I have been obliged to make a selection among the historical episodes and passages from the writings of the saints, which throw light on my general subject, in order that I might be able to treat the episodes and passages so selected with some fulness of detailed statement and discussion. I particularly regret that I have been unable to discuss the history of the Roman pontificate in relation to the four great heresies connected with the names of Arius, Pelagius, Nestorius, and Eutyches, and also that I have been able to say so very little about the third, fourth, and fifth of the Ecumenical Councils, and less than I could have wished about the first and second.¹

In the third lecture and in the earlier part of the sixth lecture I have discussed the witness of Holy Scripture in regard to the two fundamental papal claims. The rest of the book is mainly taken up with an appeal, in regard to those claims, to the acts and writings of the great saints of the Primitive Church. It was the fact that such an appeal constitutes the main argument of the book, which decided me in the choice of its title. I do not think that it is necessary for me to vindicate the importance of such an appeal. The genuine sons of the Church of England have always professed themselves to be ready to abide by it; and the traditional theology of the Roman communion has

[¹ In this enlarged edition the history of the relations of Liberius and Damasus to the Arian movement is set forth with considerable fulness, and there is a good deal of additional matter dealing with the first two Ecumenical Councils. The reader is also referred to Dr. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*. In that work Dr. Bright has discussed the relations of the papacy to Pelagianism on pp. 126-136; to the Council of Ephesus on pp. 144-171, and to the Council of Chalcedon on pp. 172-210. The subject of the relations of the papacy to Pelagianism is also discussed in an article, entitled *Two Roman Controversialists*, which appeared in the *Church Quarterly* for April, 1897; and the relations of Popes Celestine and Leo to the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon are discussed in an article entitled *Rivington on the Roman Primacy*, 430-451, which appeared in the *Church Quarterly* for 1899. These two articles may be regarded as supplementary to Dr. Bright's book. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of those who may read this note, to Dr. Bright's discussion of the cases of S. Denys of Alexandria and of Paul of Samosata, and also to his treatment of the dealings of Pope S. Julius with the Easterns (cf. *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 53-57, and pp. 81-85).—(July, 1900).]

been accustomed to assign a very high place to the witness of the Fathers. If there are any Roman Catholics in the present day who shrink from the appeal to the saints of the Primitive Church, it is desirable that they should be encouraged to declare their opinions openly. While we shall sincerely grieve at the declension from the Catholic standard which such a change of front would betoken, the explicit abandonment of the traditional argument of the Church's defenders will at any rate show how hopeless it is to defend the modern claims of the papacy by an appeal to the witness of the Primitive Church. New doctrines need new theological methods to uphold them. As for us, we are content to stand upon the old paths.

As I have said, my appeal is mainly to the acts and writings of the saints of the Primitive Church; and for the purposes of this argument I acknowledge none as saints except those whose sanctity the Church has recognized in some formal way. It was not until the twelfth century that in the West the canonization of saints was reserved to the pope. In the earlier times the right of decreeing the recognition of the sanctity of this or that servant of God appertained, in the first place, to the bishop of the diocese to which he belonged. Such a decree would, when first promulgated, be authoritative only within the bishop's own sphere of jurisdiction; but, if it was approved and accepted by other bishops, it would gradually acquire a wider and in many cases an ecumenical authority. In later times, before the twelfth century, the decrees of canonization usually emanated from the Provincial Synods.¹ In the great patriarchal sees there was sometimes a tendency to canonize patriarchs who can hardly be said to have deserved the honour. The Bollandists have noted this tendency in regard to some of the occupants of the see of Constantinople, but the same thing might be said with truth concerning some Roman popes. In dealing

¹ Mabillon, *Acta SS. ord. S. Bened.*, tom. vii. pp. lix., lx., *Praefat. in saec. decim.*, §§ 91, 92; cf. Benedict XIV., *De serv. Dei beatif. et beat. canoniz.*, lib. i. cap. vi. § 9, *Opp.* tom. i. p. 17, ed. 1767. The saints, to whose testimony appeal is made in this book, are for the most part venerated throughout the Church, both in the East and in the West. In some few cases the veneration of this or that saint may, according to circumstances, be confined to the East or to the West. Where the veneration is purely local, as in the case of the ten saintly bishops of Como (p. 405), attention is called to the fact.

with the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, I have not felt bound to use the title of saint in every case in which the name of this or that bishop has found a place in the local calendar.

Although these lectures were originally addressed to a clerical audience, I hope that they may be found to have some interest for that large and increasing body of laymen who recognize the importance of these questions. Having this object in view, and feeling sure that in any case some of those whom I should most wish to interest in the main argument of my book, would be repelled by the frequent occurrence of quotations in the Latin and Greek languages, I have tried to keep Latin and Greek as much as possible out of the *text* of the lectures, and to relegate quotations in those languages to the notes. I have not scrupled to lighten my own labour by using any accessible translations of patristic passages which I wished to quote in English. I do not think that I have ever done so without carefully comparing the translation with the original, and without correcting any expression occurring in the translation which seemed to need correction.

I hope that I have not anywhere transgressed the rules of Christian courtesy. The nature of my argument is of such a character that I have been compelled at times to criticize and controvert the statements and arguments of others; but I should be extremely sorry if there was a single word which might seem to be either uncharitable or consciously unfair.

I had written thus far, when I received a copy of the Preface with which the Bishop of Lincoln has enriched my book. I wish to express my gratitude to him for the Preface itself, and for his kindness in finding time to write it in the midst of his unceasing pastoral labours. Perhaps I ought to have foreseen that his affection would lead him to speak of me in a way that I do not deserve. May our Lord reward him, both now and in the world to come, for the manifold ways in which he has poured out his goodness upon me, ever since the old Cuddesdon days, more than a quarter of a century ago.

I desire also to thank Dr. Bright for taking the trouble to read over the proof-sheets of the fifth lecture, and for making

several helpful suggestions in regard to the treatment of the case of Apiarius.

My thanks are also due to other kind friends, who have been good enough to answer questions, and who have in that way put me in the right track, and enabled me to solve various problems. But I must specially record my gratitude to my friend the Rev. V. S. S. Coles, of the Pusey House, who read carefully through the manuscript of this book, and whose remarks have led me to add here and there notes which will, I think, strengthen the general argument.

Lastly, I must thank my friend and brother, the Rev. P. N. Waggett, for his careful correction of the proof-sheets of the whole book, and for the help which he has given me in the work of making the index, and in other ways.

F. W. P.

THE MISSION HOUSE, COWLEY S. JOHN,
Feast of S. Patrick, 1893.

PART I.

THE POPES HAVE NO DIVINELY GIVEN PRIMACY OF JURISDICTION.

LECTURE I.

THE SEE OF ROME IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.—I.

Introductory—Primitive organization and precedence—The Paschal controversy—The Irenæan passage.

I AM to speak to you, my dear brothers, in these lectures about the controversy which we, who belong to the English branch of the Catholic Church, have continually to carry on with the upholders of the claims of the Roman papacy. I suppose that most of us would very much prefer to keep aloof from controversy; or, if we must have it, we should wish to spend our time and labour in doing battle with the materialists and positivists and agnostics who set themselves to undermine the very foundation of the Christian faith. If it were possible, we should like to treat our Roman Catholic neighbours as brethren, differing from us in certain matters of more or less importance, but whose work, taken as a whole, we could accept as a substantial aid in the struggle with sin and unbelief. Now, undoubtedly there are English Roman Catholic writers and workers whom we *can* regard in this more favourable light. We thank God for their writings and for their work, and we desire to profit by their wholesome teaching and by their good Christian example. Unfortunately, when we consider the Roman communion in England as a whole, we are obliged to admit that there is another side to the matter. One very prominent aspect of that communion is the controversial position which she takes up in regard to the spiritual *status* and spiritual claims of our Mother, the Church of England. I do not complain of this controversial attitude. If a man sincerely believes that the Roman pope is infallible, and that communion with him is one of the divinely ordained conditions of salvation; if he adheres to the dogmatic definition of Pope Boniface VIII. in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*, in which occurs the following passage: "We

therefore declare, assert, and define that for every human creature it is altogether necessary to salvation that he be subject to the Roman pontiff ;"¹—I say that, if a man holds with sincerity such a faith as that, he is bound to do what he can, as opportunity may offer, to bring his neighbours and fellow-countrymen to the same belief with himself ; and here, in England, he will almost necessarily have to take up a position of controversial antagonism to the claims of the English Church. But then, on the other hand, we, who repudiate these papal theories ; we, who hold that those theories were the offspring of ambition and ignorance, and that they have been spread by violence and forgery, and who with all our hearts accept the Church of England as historically the authentic representative of the Catholic Church of Christ in this country ;—we, I say, are forced almost against our will to do battle from time to time on behalf of our spiritual mother ; and we are, therefore, bound to equip ourselves with some sufficient knowledge of the controversy between England and Rome, so that whether in public or in private we may be able to strengthen our people against those who would undermine their faith in the Catholicity of that branch of the Church to which they belong. Moreover, for the sake of our own peace of mind, it is of the highest importance that we should become solidly convinced that in our controversy with Rome about the papal claims, the truth is substantially on our side.

It was the sense of the importance of helping my brethren to have clear and true views on this matter, which led me to accede to your secretary's invitation to give this course of lectures. I confess that I enter on them with fear and trembling ; not from any doubt as to the side on which the truth lies, but from my consciousness of the very imperfect way in which I shall be able to handle the subject, and from the dread that I may do more harm than good by my treatment of it. I will ask your prayers that I may be helped and guided to say what shall tend to promote God's glory, and the Church's well-being, and the good of souls. I will do my utmost to be fair and accurate. If I make slips, as may very easily happen, I shall gladly correct them, when they are pointed out ; I do not want to win a victory by any

¹ "Porro subesse Romano Pontifici, omni humane creature declaramus, dicimus, et diffinimus omnino esse de necessitate salutis." This bull is in the *Regestum* of Boniface VIII., in the Vatican library. A heliotype copy of it was published in 1888, in a work edited by Father Denifle and entitled *Specimina palaeographica Regestorum Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio III. usque ad Urbanum V.* (see the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for July, 1889, tome xlvi. pp. 253-257). The bull is also to be found among the *Extravagantes Communes* of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, lib. i. tit. viii. cap. i. (ed. Friedberg, ii. 1245, 1246).

assertions or arguments which will not stand the test of investigation. I hope sincerely that no mistakes will be made, the exposure of which would endanger the solidity of the proof of those central facts on which the argument really hinges.

And now to come more directly to our subject. I cannot, of course, attempt in five lectures to cover the whole ground of this far-reaching controversy. I must make a selection; and I select the papal claim to a primacy of jurisdiction,¹ because the discussion of that claim will take us into the very heart of the matter. I propose, if I have time, to deal with the following divisions of the subject:—

1. The position of the see of Rome during the first three centuries.

2. The relation of S. Peter to the Apostolic College and to the Church.

3. The origin and growth of the papal jurisdiction.

4. The truth about the unity of the Church.²

My purpose is to deal with these different points with special reference to their bearing on the modern Roman claims, and it will therefore be well to set those claims before you in their most authentic form. We could not have them in a more authentic form than in the decrees of the Vatican Council of the year 1870. That council is accepted by the pope and by the Roman Catholic hierarchy and by the whole Roman Catholic Church as an Ecumenical Council. It was in their view an Ecumenical Council, *over which the pope himself presided*. The decrees were promulgated by Pope Pius IX. from his presidential throne. There were 535 votes registered, of which 533 were in favour of the decrees with which we are dealing, and two only were adverse.³ After the suspension of the council, the decrees were accepted by all the other bishops of the Roman communion. In quoting the Vatican decrees, I am quoting an authority which cannot be gainsaid by any member of the Roman Catholic Church. What, then, do these decrees say in reference to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff? They say, or rather the pope and the council say in them, that "the Roman Church, by the appointment of the Lord, holds the chief authority of

¹ In lectures vi.-xii., which were not delivered with the others, I have discussed the cognate but not identical claim which is made on behalf of the pope, when it is asserted that he is the necessary centre of communion for the whole Church.

² The fourth heading is dealt with in the seven lectures which constitute the second part of this book (see pp. 215-433).

³ After the voting, the pope, rising from his seat, said, "Decreta et Canones, qui in Constitutione modo lectâ continentur, placuerunt Patribus omnibus, duobus exceptis: Nosque, sacro approbante Concilio, illa et illos, ut lecta sunt, definimus et Apostolicâ auctoritate confirmamus" (*Collectio Lacensis*, tom. vii. coll. 487, 488).

ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction belonging to the Roman pontiff is a truly episcopal power," and that "it is an immediate power." They go on to say that all the pastors and all the faithful, whether taken separately or taken all together, are bound to the authority of the pope "by the obligation of true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in things pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world." They add that "this is the teaching of the Catholic truth, and that no one can deviate from it without the loss of his faith and salvation." They further teach that, in consequence of the apostolic primacy which the Roman pontiff enjoys *jure divino*, "he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that recourse may be had to his judgement in all causes which appertain to the jurisdiction of the Church;" "that the judgement of the apostolic see cannot be revised by any one, and that no one may pass judgement on its decisions; wherefore those who affirm that it is allowable to appeal from the judgements of the Roman pontiffs to an Ecumenical Council as to an authority higher than the pope, are wandering from the straight pathway of truth." They pronounce an anathema on "any one who asserts that the Roman pontiff has only an office of inspection or direction, but not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church;" or "that he has only the chief part, and not the total plenitude, of that supreme power."¹

Assuredly, if these decrees truly represent the mind of our Lord, we must accept the view commonly attributed to Cardinal Cajetan, namely, that "the Church is the born handmaid of the pope."²

And we are not to suppose that it is the theory of the Roman Church that this teaching about the power of the pontiff is some late development unknown to antiquity. On the contrary, the pope, when he promulgated the decree from which I have been quoting, expressly stated, in his own name and in the name of the council, that he rested his teaching on the plain testimony of Holy Scripture, and that in this definition he was adhering to the clear and perspicuous decrees of his predecessors, the Roman pontiffs, and of the General Councils.

This, then, is the teaching, the truth or falsehood of which

¹ These passages are quoted from the *Constitutio dogmatica prima de Ecclesiâ Christi*, which was passed by the council and confirmed by the pope at the fourth session, on July 18, 1870 (cf. *Collect. Lacens.*, vii. 482-487).

² Cf. *Apol. Tractat. de Comparat. Auctorit. Papæ et Concil.*, cap. i. I must confess that I have some doubts as to whether this passage, when taken with its context, bears out the common idea about its meaning.

we are to investigate. And we are to begin this morning by considering the position of the see of Rome during the first three centuries.

The local church in Rome was organized in early times in precisely the same way as the local churches in other cities.¹ Each local church was governed by a bishop, who had his priests and deacons to assist him. When the bishop of any church died, his successor was normally chosen from among the priests or deacons who formed the clergy of that church. This was the rule at Rome, as it was the rule elsewhere. The bishops of the various churches looked on each other as brothers and colleagues. When Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, writes to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, he begins his letter as follows: "Cornelius to Cyprian, his brother, greeting;" and he concludes with the words, "Fare thee well, dearest brother."² And when Cyprian replies, he writes in the same strain: "Cyprian to Cornelius, his brother, greeting;" and he goes on, "You have acted, dearest brother, with diligence and affection, in dispatching to us in haste Nicephorus the acolyte."³ We have various letters written by S. Cyprian to other Roman bishops besides Cornelius, as, for example, to Lucius and to Stephen, and they are all written in the same tone of perfect equality. Similarly, when S. Cyprian writes to another African bishop about the Roman pope, he alludes to him, not as a superior, but as an equal. To Pompeius, Bishop of Sabrata, Cyprian says, "Since you have desired to be informed what answer our brother Stephen returned to my letter, I have sent you a copy of that answer; on reading which you will more and more discover his error."⁴ Stephen is, of course, the pope.

All the bishops, wherever their sees might be, were held to be successors of the apostles, both as regards order and as regards jurisdiction; so that, as the great Belgian canonist,

¹ Some modern Protestant writers suppose that the episcopate did not exist at Rome until the second century. Bishop Lightfoot, on the other hand, says concerning the names of S. Linus and S. Anencletus, the two bishops of Rome who, according to tradition, immediately followed the apostles and preceded S. Clement, "I see no reason to question that they not only represent historical persons, but that they were bishops in the sense of monarchical rulers of the Roman Church, though their monarchy may have been much less autocratic than the episcopate even of the succeeding century" (*S. Clement of Rome*, ed. 1890, i. 340; compare i. 68).

² *Ep. S. Cornelii, inter Cyprianicas* xlvi., *Opp.*, ed. Hartel, ii. 608.

³ *Ep. lii. § 1, Opp.*, ii. 616.

⁴ *Ep. lxxiv. ad Pompeium, § 1, Opp.*, ii. 799. One may also notice that S. Cyprian, writing (*Ep. lv. § 1, Opp.*, ii. 624) to the Bishop Antonianus, speaks of "our colleague Cornelius" ("Cornelium collegam nostrum"), and of "our brother bishop Cornelius" ("Cornelio co-episcopo nostro"); and writing (*Ep. ix. § 1, Opp.*, ii. 488) to the priests and deacons of Rome about Pope Fabian, he calls him "that good man my colleague" ("boni viri collegae mei").

Van Espen, says, "The bishops receive by succession the very authority of the apostles, so that whatever the apostles had of episcopal power—that is, of power concerned with the government of the Church—has been transferred by them into the bishops, as their successors in the Church's administration and government."¹ It is important to notice that Van Espen, following the early writers, teaches that the bishops succeed to the apostles, not only in matters connected with order, such as the power of confirming and ordaining, but also in matters connected with jurisdiction, such as the administration and government of the Church. Moreover, he says that in their governing authority the bishops succeed not merely to this or that apostle, but to all of them in common; in other words, each bishop inherits the whole episcopal jurisdiction of the apostolic college.² To use the words of S. Cyprian: "The episcopate is one, an [undivided] share of which is held by each of the bishops in such wise as that they are, each of them, joint-tenants of the whole" ("Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur").³ And the result of this primitive teaching, as Van Espen points out, is that "essentially, and setting aside later legislation, all bishops are equal in their power and authority in governing the Church."⁴

Having laid down the doctrine of the essential equality of all bishops, not only as regards order, but also as regards jurisdiction, as a foundation, we go on to notice two cross-principles, which came in afterwards, and in practice modified that equality. The first cross-principle is the special authority which gradually grew up in the church of the principal city of each of the geographical regions which collectively made up the Roman empire.⁵ As a rule, Christianity would get a

¹ *Jus Eccl. Univ.*, I. xvi. i. 7. Dr. Neale describes Van Espen as "the first canonist of his own or of any age" (*History of the Church of Holland*, p. 175). He was born in 1646, and died in 1728.

² By what may be called the by-laws of the Church, a bishop is, under ordinary circumstances, restrained from exercising his jurisdiction outside of his own particular diocese; but in a provincial synod a bishop legislates for the province, and in an Ecumenical Synod for the Church at large.

³ S. Cyp. *De Unit. Eccl.*, § 5, *Opp.*, i. 214. Archbishop Benson (Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i. 745), describing S. Cyprian's teaching in this passage, says, "The apostleship, continued for ever in the episcopate, is thus universal, yet one; each bishop's authority perfect and independent, yet not forming with the others a mere agglomerate, but being a full tenure on a totality, like that of a shareholder in a joint-stock property." The expression "in solidum" is a technical legal phrase. Examples of its use may be found under the second title of the 45th book of the Digest (vol. ii. pp. 677-680, ed. Mommsen, 1870). To give one instance—Priscus Javolenus says, "Cum duo eandem pecuniam aut promiserint aut stipulati sunt, ipso jure et singuli in solidum debentur et singuli debent: ideoque petitione acceptatione[ve] unius tota solvitur obligatio."

⁴ *Suppl. in Jus Univ. Eccl.*, I. xvi. i. 7.

⁵ In some cases the limits of the ecclesiastical province did not coincide with

footing first in the metropolis of each region. The other lesser cities would be evangelized by missions sent forth from thence; and so the suffragan sees would look on themselves as daughters of the metropolitan see. The metropolitan bishop was the natural centre of unity for the bishops of the province. When a see became vacant, it would be the metropolitan who would call together his brother bishops to consult about the appointment of a worthy pastor to succeed to the empty throne; and the metropolitan would naturally preside at the preliminary meetings for consultation and election, as well as at the consecration itself. If troubles arose among the bishops, whether heresies or schisms or quarrels or other wrong-doings, or if new and difficult questions emerged, concerning which it seemed desirable that the neighbouring bishops should act together, it would be natural for the bishops to meet in synod, and it would also be natural that the metropolitan should take the initiative and summon his brethren; and the metropolis would normally be the obvious place of meeting. Under such circumstances the metropolitan would of course preside, and in most cases he would be entrusted by the synod with the duty of seeing that its decisions were carried out. Thus by the natural course of events, and by the free action of the essentially co-equal prelates, a certain precedence and pre-eminence, and, more than that, a certain right of initiative and of inspection and of administration, would by common consent be lodged in the occupant of the metropolitan see.¹ But the very fact that what we may call the provincial system grew up naturally, and adapted itself to the varying geographical and ethnographical and political circumstances of the several regions, would necessarily result in a great want of uniformity. In some places the ecclesiastical provinces would be very small; in others they would be very much larger. The bishops of the great cities of the empire, such as Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Carthage, would naturally extend their influence over a far wider area than

the limits of the civil province. Geographical facilities of access made themselves more felt than the provincial boundaries, as laid down by the imperial government; e.g. the Bishops of Tyre and Ptolemais, in the province of Syria, attended a synod at Caesarea, in Palestine, in the latter part of the second century (cf. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, pp. 18, 19).

¹ Compare Möhler, *On the Unity of the Church*, part ii. chap. ii. §§ 57-60 (French translation, pp. 189-198, ed. Bruxelles, 1839). Möhler's summary of this chapter is worth noting: "Les communautés voisines se réunissent, et leurs évêques forment un tout uni ensemble qui se crée un organe et un centre dans la personne du métropolitain," etc. There is an admirable paragraph describing the natural process by which the office of the metropolitan grew up, in an article by Father de Smedt, S.J., the President of the Bollandists, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for October, 1891, pp. 424, 425. The title of the article is, *L'organisation des Églises Chrétiennes au III^e siècle*. Compare Duchesne, *Origines Chrétiennes*, pp. 334, 335.

would the bishops of places like Thessalonica or Corinth. Thus there would be large provinces and small provinces, and the metropolitan of a large province would normally be a more important person than the metropolitan of a small province. And again, while the system was growing up, there would be no necessary uniformity in regard to the measure of power which was delegated by the bishops of the province to the metropolitan. In a small province containing several flourishing churches, the suffragan bishops would maintain a very independent position, delegating only the *minimum* of initiative and direction to the metropolitan. In a large province containing one very important central church and a great number of relatively weak churches, there would be a strong centralizing tendency, and the metropolitan bishop would be entrusted with very large powers over his suffragans. Such was eminently the case with the churches in the two chief cities of the empire, Rome and Alexandria. The Bishop of Rome presided in ante-Nicene times, as metropolitan, over the bishops throughout Italy; and ultimately the three islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica were aggregated to his province.¹ Similarly, the Bishop of Alexandria was the ecclesiastical centre, not only for Egypt, but also for Libya and the Pentapolis; and both at Rome and Alexandria the metropolitan bishops exerted an authority over their suffragans which was quite abnormal and tended to obscure the inherent equality of the various members of the episcopal body. Doubtless this tendency did not show itself fully during the first three centuries, and perhaps during those centuries there was nothing actually unhealthy; but undoubtedly the great concentration of authority which gradually grew up in those sees constituted a germ, which might easily develop into a source of danger.²

I hope that I have now made it clear, that the civil

¹ Cf. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 30. See also Additional Note 1, p. 434.

² Cf. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 375, n. 2, as regards the relations of the Bishop of Rome to his suburbicarian suffragans. In illustration of the statement in the text, so far as it deals with Alexandria, I would refer to the article on "Synesius" in Smith and Wace, *D.C.B.* (iv. 779). The writer of the article says, "Equally noticeable is the unqualified obedience which Synesius, though himself Metropolitan of Pentapolis, cheerfully yielded to the 'apostolic throne' of Alexandria. 'It is at once my wish and my duty to consider whatever decree comes from that throne binding upon me,' he writes, to [the patriarch] Theophilus. The unquestionable superiority of Alexandria to all the cities of Eastern Africa had given to the Patriarch of Alexandria an authority over the bishops of those cities unsurpassed, even if it was rivalled, by the supremacy of Rome in that day over the bishoprics of Central and Southern Italy." See also Dr. Bright's *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils*, pp. 17, 18, 207-209, and Professor Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, p. 30, n.

importance of the city, in which an episcopal see was erected, very often reacted on the ecclesiastical relations of the bishop of that see to the bishops of the cities round about. Moreover, in the case of the leading cities of the empire, such as Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Carthage, Ephesus, the order of their relative importance, as estimated by common opinion, was reproduced in the hierarchy of the Church. Thus the city of Rome was the capital of the empire; and as a result the Bishop of Rome took precedence of the other bishops in the Church.¹ Alexandria was commonly regarded as the second city in the empire, and the Bishop of Alexandria ranked next to the Bishop of Rome in the order of the Catholic episcopate; and so on with the rest. And this precedence carried with it influence. In all organized bodies the highest person is most often made a referee or arbitrator, simply because he is highest. People naturally consult the one who stands first. Under normal circumstances, he is the natural spokesman and representative of the whole body on occasions when some spokesman or representative is needed. And what takes place in other organized bodies necessarily took place and still takes place in the Church. We have only to look at our own English branch of the Church, and we see it taking place on a large scale there. The *jurisdiction* of the Archbishop of Canterbury is confined to the province of Canterbury;² but just because he is, by the consent of all, acknowledged to be the first bishop on the roll of the Anglican episcopate, therefore his *influence* extends throughout the whole Anglican communion. He naturally presides in the Lambeth Conference; he has the chief share in deciding what subjects shall be discussed there; his advice is continually asked in regard to matters occurring in the colonial churches; in a very true sense the care of all the churches is upon him; and all this comes to him simply because he is first. No canon gives him this influence; nor does that influence arise out of his pretending to any primacy by divine right. He wields it simply because, in the providence of God, he stands first on the list. And we may see in him a picture of what, in early days, took place in regard to the Bishop of Rome, and also in their measure in regard to the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and the rest.

Thus the principle of inherent equality, without being in

¹ See Additional Note 2, p. 435.

² There are a few scattered colonial and missionary dioceses which belong to no colonial province, and which look to the Archbishop of Canterbury as their quasi-metropolitan; but they may be considered to be appendages of the province of Canterbury. Their position is abnormal, and in time they will doubtless get more into line.

any way abrogated, was modified by the first cross-principle of metropolitanical authority and of civil precedence.

The second of the cross-principles which modified the inherent equality of all bishops was the special influence which attached to those sees which had been founded by the apostles.¹ These sees were called the Apostolic Sees, and the churches in which they were erected were called the Apostolic Churches. They were the original mother churches which had received their instruction in the faith directly from the apostles, and had been ordered by them in all matters of discipline, and had had their first bishops consecrated by them. Other churches, whether near or far away, in their first beginnings had received the light of the gospel either immediately or mediately from one or other of them. And a certain halo of sanctity and of special influence distinguished them from the churches which could not boast of an apostolic founder. When disputes arose in regard to matters of faith or discipline, and the question to be answered was, What was the teaching of the apostles? what was the custom of the apostles? it was a very common practice to consult the nearest apostolic church, not as if it were infallible, but as having received the apostolic deposit of faith and discipline at first hand from one or more of the apostles, and therefore as being more likely to have retained that deposit free from all alloy. Without pretending to give an exhaustive list of the Apostolic Churches, one might name the following in the order of the dates of their apostolic foundation: First, Jerusalem, "the mother of all churches," as the Fathers of the great Council of Constantinople, of the year 382, style it in their letter to Pope Damasus and the other Western bishops; then Antioch, that "most ancient and truly Apostolic Church," as the same council describes it; then Philippi, then Thessalonica, then Corinth, then Ephesus, then Rome, then Alexandria, then Smyrna. We cannot say for certain that any apostle was ever at Alexandria, but it was considered to be an apostolic see, either because its first bishop, S. Mark, had received his mission, and probably his consecration, from S. Peter, whose catechist and interpreter he had been; or, perhaps more probably, because S. Mark was, like his cousin, S. Barnabas, regarded as an apostle in an extended sense of that term; or finally because, in any case, S. Mark was what Tertullian calls—"an apostolic man" (compare p. 39). Similarly, Smyrna was apostolic because S. Polycarp was constituted bishop of that see by S. John.² This is how Tertullian, arguing with heretics, speaks about

¹ See Additional Note 3, p. 435.

² Tertullian, *De Praescr. Haer.* xxxii.

the Apostolic Churches: "Come, now," he says, "thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, go through the Apostolic Churches, in which the very seats of the apostles, at this very day, preside over their own places; in which their own authentic writings are read, speaking with the voice of each, and making the face of each present to the eye. Is Achaia near to thee? thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, where we also (*i.e.* we in Africa) have an authority close at hand."¹ No one ever suggested that the special influence which attached to the apostolic sees, and the reverence which was yielded to them, was a matter of positive divine appointment. It was the natural reverence of Christians for the holy apostles, and for everything which seemed in a special way to have come in contact with the apostles.

So, to sum up this part of our subject, by divine right all bishops were inherently equal, but by custom and ecclesiastical legislation the bishops of the metropolitan sees acquired certain rights which were delegated to them by their brother bishops. Moreover, among the most important churches a certain order of precedence grew up, which corresponded with what may be called the civil dignity of the cities in which those churches existed; and, finally, the churches which were founded by the apostles were treated with peculiar reverence.

If we now confine our attention to the more powerful churches which took the lead in ecclesiastical matters, it will be worth while to ask the question whether their influence mainly rested on what I have called the civil dignity of the city, or on the apostolic character of the see. I think that there can be no doubt that their influence mainly resulted from the civil dignity of the city. For example, during the greater part of the first three centuries the see of Jerusalem, which in the apostolic days had been the most influential of all sees, exerted very little influence on the general course of Church affairs. The city had been destroyed by Hadrian, and the new city was comparatively feeble and uninfluential. So, again, Philippi and Corinth, which were apostolical, had much less influence than Carthage, the capital of Africa, which made no pretence to an apostolic foundation. If we compare Antioch with Alexandria, we find that both S. Peter and S. Paul had spent some time in Antioch, whereas Alexandria could only trace back to S. Mark the Evangelist, and through him indirectly to S. Peter. Judged by apostolic pretensions, Antioch ought to have ranked before Alexandria; but

¹ *De Praescr. Haer.* xxxvi.

Alexandria was commonly regarded as the second city of the empire, and Antioch as the third,¹ and the order of reputed civil dignity governed the situation.² The Church of Alexandria, though only quasi-apostolical, ranked second, and "the truly Apostolical Church" of Antioch ranked third. And doubtless as it was with all the other churches, so it was with Rome. If we ask why the Church of Rome ranked first, the true answer undoubtedly is that Rome was the imperial city, the capital of the civilized world. The primacy hinged on that. The fact that S. Peter and S. Paul had been the apostolic founders of the Roman Church, and had been martyred there, would never by itself have resulted in the primacy of that Church, any more than the fact of Jerusalem being the place where the Saviour died and rose again, and where the Church had come fully into existence on the day of Pentecost, availed in default of civil dignity to secure any commanding position for the Church of the holy city. The apostolicity of the Roman Church immensely added to its influence and helped to attract to it the reverence of Christians all over the world; but the imperial position of the city of Rome was the determining factor which secured for it the primacy.³ Undoubtedly the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon was historically right, when in its twenty-eighth canon it defined that "the Fathers properly gave the privileges to the throne of the elder Rome, *because that was the imperial city.*"⁴ The position could not be more accurately stated.

¹ Tillemont (ii. 92) speaks of Alexandria as being "cette grande ville qui estoit la première de l'Empire après Rome." Dion Chrysostom, who flourished during the reigns of Nerva and Trajan, addressing the citizens of Alexandria, says (*Orat. xxii. ad Alexandrinos*, ed. Arnim, 1893, vol. i. p. 277), "Your city excels most exceedingly in size and situation, and is notoriously considered as the second among the cities under the sun." Josephus (*De Bello Jud.*, iii. 2, *Opp.*, ed. Havercamp, 1726, ii. 221, 222), speaking of Antioch, says that "in size and other advantages it indisputably held the third place in the Roman world." Compare Aubé, *L'Église et l'État*, pp. 451, 452, ed. 1886.

² See Additional Note 4, p. 435.

³ Dr. Bright (*Church Quarterly*, vol. xlix. p. 14, note 1) says, "No doubt the connexion of both Peter and Paul with the Roman Church, did much to build up her 'primacy of honour and influence;' but its original basis was the grandeur of the 'Urbs' itself, as the centre of the Roman world." This statement seems to me to express the exact truth.

⁴ The truth of the statement in the text does not in any way depend on the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon being a canon of ecumenical authority. S. Leo, and the West following S. Leo, rejected the canon. But it still remains the fact that the council as a whole passed it, and that the East in practice obeyed it; and there can be no doubt that, whether the decree was or was not ecumenically binding, its statement about the origin of the privileges of the Roman see is historically correct. The divine origin of the jurisdiction claimed by the popes is a fundamental dogma among modern Roman Catholics, or rather it is, in their view, the fundamental dogma. One would think that Roman Catholic students of the canons must be somewhat puzzled to find a great Ecumenical Council, in which all manner of circumstances combined to give a most commanding position to the pope, passing a canon which lays down as an obvious undeniable truth that

The primatial privileges of the Roman see were not of divine institution ; they were “*given by the Fathers,*” and they were given on the ground of the imperial authority and dignity of the city.

To sum up what has been said in regard to the Roman Church. After the destruction of Jerusalem, which during the first forty years after Pentecost had been the natural metropolis of Christendom, the churches which had been constituted in the great cities of the empire took the lead in the order of the civil precedence commonly attributed to them, with the Church of imperial Rome necessarily in the first place. The mere fact of holding the first place was a cause of growing influence. One result of the pre-eminent influence of the Roman see was that the ecclesiastical province over which it acquired metropolitan jurisdiction was much larger than any other province in the Church, except that over which the see of Alexandria, ranking next to Rome in honour, presided. The see of Rome had also the glory of having been founded by the two great apostles, S. Peter and S. Paul, who were martyred outside the walls of the city, and whose bodies were reverently treasured and had in honour by the Roman Church. The Roman see was, therefore, very eminently an apostolic see, and it was the only apostolic see in the Western or Latin-speaking half of the Church. In the East apostolic sees in some sense abounded. In the West there was but one, and that one was the primatial see

the privileges of the Roman see were given to it “by the Fathers,” because Rome “was the imperial city.” For a good account of the enacting of the twenty-eighth canon, and of the way in which, notwithstanding the pope’s protests, the canon practically held its ground, see a powerful article in the *Church Quarterly* for October, 1889, entitled, *A Roman Proselyte on Ancient Church History*, pp. 131–133. Mgr. Duchesne, one of the most learned, if not the most learned, of living French ecclesiastics, and who, in everything that he writes, is refreshingly fair and straightforward, describes (*Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 24) how the popes refused to accept the canons of Constantinople and Chalcedon, which regulated the precedence and jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople ; but he candidly adds, “*mais leur voix fut peu écoutée ; on leur accorda sans doute des satisfactions, mais de pure cérémonie.*” In ante-Nicene times even ceremonial satisfactions would have been refused, as the histories of Popes Victor and Stephen show. Mr. Richardson (*What are the Catholic Claims?* p. 93) attempts to reply to the Fathers of Chalcedon by asking the question, “Can any one point to a human grant of the primacy to Rome?” The inconclusiveness of the argument implied in that question may be shown by asking another, “Can any one point to a human grant of the primacy over Africa to Carthage? or of the primacy over Palestine to Caesarea?” Yet who supposes that the jurisdiction of those sees was secured to them by the *jus divinum*? Compare the remarks of Möhler and of Father de Smedt, to which reference is made in the note on p. 7. It ought to be observed that, when the Fathers of Chalcedon attributed the privileges of the Roman see to the fact that it was the imperial city, they were merely repeating what the second Ecumenical Council had implied in its third canon, seventy years before (see Dr. Bright’s *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils*, p. 93, 1st edit.).

of the whole Church. No wonder that the Bishop of Rome was held in high honour, and was the natural person to take the initiative in movements affecting the whole body. But we must be careful not to exaggerate in this matter. There was a marked primacy of honour and influence, but there was no primacy of jurisdiction. The inherent jurisdiction of the Roman see was exactly the same as the inherent jurisdiction of every other see in Christendom. Its acquired or delegated jurisdiction was limited first to the whole of Italy, and then later, from about the middle of the fourth century, to the suburbicarian provinces of Central and Southern Italy with the adjacent islands. Outside those provinces, throughout the Church, but especially in the West, Rome had influence, but no actual jurisdiction,¹ whether patriarchal or papal. Similarly the Bishop of Alexandria's acquired jurisdiction was limited to Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis, but his influence extended over the whole Church, and especially over the East.

In the preceding statement I have tried to set before you a true view of the relations of the various sees to one another, and especially of the relation of the Bishop of Rome to his brothers and colleagues in the episcopate during the first three centuries. The justification of that statement will be perceived if the facts of early Church history and the writings of the early Fathers are studied. As I am giving a lecture, and not writing an exhaustive treatise, I can only discuss a small selection of facts and passages, but I honestly think that the selection which I shall make will be a fair selection. I propose, then, to consider—

1. The Paschal controversy in the time of Pope Victor :
2. The famous passage of S. Irenaeus about the Roman Church :
3. The history of S. Cyprian of Carthage.

The Paschal Controversy.

The bishops of Proconsular Asia, the metropolis of which was Ephesus, had been accustomed ever since the time of the apostles to keep the feast of Easter on the day of the Paschal full moon, whether that day fell on a Sunday or on any other day of the week. The bishops in all, or almost all, the other provinces of the Church, both in the East and in the West, kept Easter on the Sunday following the Paschal full moon. The bishops of the province of Ephesus asserted that they had received their custom by tradition from S. John ; and one can hardly doubt that that assertion of theirs was

¹ See Additional Note 5, p. 436.

true, because S. Polycarp assured the Roman pope, Anicetus, that he had always so kept the feast "with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles with whom he had lived."¹ However, the churches which kept Easter on Sunday also claimed that they had received their custom by tradition from the apostles. During the greater part of the second century the two customs went on side by side, and yet the Church was not disturbed by any serious dissension in connexion with this matter. On the contrary, when the Christians from Asia came to Rome, they were allowed to keep the feast on their own Asiatic day, although the Roman Church itself kept the feast always on the Sunday. This large-hearted tolerance was exhibited by the five Roman bishops, Xystus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus,² whose pontificates lasted from about A.D. 118 to about A.D. 165. It seems probable that Pope Soter, the successor of Anicetus, forbade the Asian Christians, who came to Rome, to keep their Asiatic Easter in Rome itself. He appears to have required all Catholic Christians living in Rome to keep the feast together on the Sunday after the full moon; but he remained in peace and fellowship with the bishops of Asia, who in their own province of Asia went on celebrating the festival on the day of the full moon. Soter's successor, Eleutherus, followed on the same lines. But Victor, who succeeded Eleutherus, and who governed the Roman Church from about A.D. 188 to A.D. 198, determined to make an effort to establish uniformity and to suppress altogether the Asiatic custom. He appears to have written letters in the name of his church to the several metropolitans, begging them to summon their provincial synods, and to discuss in them the question of the proper day for the celebration of the Easter festival. It is important to notice exactly what the pope's action was at this initial stage. He was the first bishop in the Church, and it was most fitting that he should take the initiative. There is no reason to suppose that by any authoritative act he *commanded* his brother-metropolitans to summon their synods. What he did was to *ask* them to do so. Polycrates, the Bishop of Ephesus, writing later on to Victor and the Roman Church, says: "I could also mention the bishops that were present [at the synod in Ephesus], whom you requested (*ἠξιώσατε*) me to summon."³ Though the word *ἠξιώω* may be used in the sense of "to require," yet this is not its only meaning. It seems to be the right word to express requests made by one

¹ Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 24.

² Tillemont, iii. 103.

³ Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 24. Tillemont (iii. 633) expresses Polycrates' meaning thus: "Polycrate dit que Victor 'lavait *prie*' d'assembler les Evêques de l'Asie."

church to another church. Thus, after the death of S. Polycarp, the Church of Smyrna wrote a short account of his martyrdom to the little Church of Philomelium in Phrygia. Towards the conclusion of the letter the Smyrnaeans say, "Ye indeed *requested* (ἠξιώσατε) that the things which happened should be shown unto you at greater length."¹ S. Clement of Rome uses the word ἠξιώω three times of *entreat-ing* or *beseeking* God.² So Pope Victor, who had no jurisdiction in the province of Asia, *requested* Polycrates the metropolitan to exercise the authority which he possessed, and to convoke (μετακαλεῖν) the bishops of his province. In compliance with the request of the Roman Church, synods were held in many provinces, as, for example, in Palestine, in Asia, in Pontus, in Gaul,³ in Osrhoene, and elsewhere. There was a unanimous determination throughout the Church, except in Asia and the neighbouring region, that Easter should be celebrated on Sunday. Victor held his own local synod in Rome; and in communicating its decision to Polycrates he appears to have threatened that if the Asians persisted in their custom, they would be cut off from the communion of the Roman Church. Polycrates, with the consent of the Asian bishops, replied in a letter full of interesting details, addressed, not to Victor only, but to the whole Roman Church, in which he says, "I am not scared by those who intimidate us [with threats], for they, who are greater than I, have said, 'We ought to obey God rather than men.'"⁴ "Upon this," Eusebius says, "Victor, the Bishop of the Church of the Romans, forthwith endeavours to cut off the churches of all Asia, together with the neighbouring churches, as heterodox, from the common unity; and he denounces them by letters, and proclaims that all the brethren there *are utterly* (ἄρδην) *separated from communion*."⁵ However, these measures did not please all the bishops. They exhort him, therefore, on the other side to pursue peace and unity and love towards his neighbours. Their writings too are extant, somewhat sharply upbraiding (πληκτικώτερον καταπομένων) Victor. Among these also was Irenaeus, who, in the name of those brethren in Gaul over whom he presided, maintains indeed that the

¹ *Mart. Pol.*, xx.

² S. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.*, li., liii. and lv.

³ Perhaps in Gaul the synod was diocesan rather than provincial. It seems probable that in the time of Victor there was only one bishopric in Gaul, the seat of which was at Lyons. See an article by Mgr. Duchesne, entitled *L'origine des diocèses épiscopaux dans l'ancienne Gaule*, which appeared in the *Bulletin et Memoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*, tome i. pp. 387-390 (Paris: 1889). See also Duchesne's *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 450.

⁴ Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 21. S. Jerome (*De Illustribus Viris*, cap. xlv., *Migne's Patrol. Lat.*, xxiii. 659) translates Polycrates' words as follows: "Non formidabo eos qui nobis minantur."

⁵ See Additional Note 6, p. 436.

mystery of the Lord's resurrection should be celebrated only on the Lord's day; but he also becomingly exhorts Victor¹ not to cut off whole churches of God, which preserve the tradition of an ancient custom. . . . And this same Irenaeus, bearing out his name, and a peacemaker in temper, exhorted and mediated in ways like these for the peace of the churches. He also wrote, not to Victor alone, but to very many other rulers of churches respecting the question which was agitated."² One would certainly conclude from the account given by Eusebius that the Asian churches persevered in the practice which they inherited from S. John. Sixty years after their dispute with Victor we seem to be able to gather from S. Firmilian that the Churches of Rome and Caesarea differed in regard to the days on which Easter was to be celebrated.³ Cappadocia and Asia were neighbouring provinces, and, if in S. Firmilian's time the former was quartodeciman, it is probable that the latter was so also. Later on, before the time of the Council of Nicaea, quartodecimanism seems to have come to an end within the communion of the Catholic Church.

There are various points in this narrative to which it may be well to call your attention. Polycrates was a man whose orthodoxy, as Eusebius tells us,⁴ was notorious, and he is described in the *Synodicon* as a very holy person;⁵ and yet when Pope Victor required him to alter his day for keeping Easter, and threatened him with excommunication if he refused, he replied that he was not scared by Victor's threats. He evidently had not been brought up in the teaching which was so clearly set forth by the Vatican Council. Polycrates, though he must have been educated among those who knew S. John, had not been taught that all the pastors and all the faithful are bound to the authority of the pope "by the obligation of true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in things pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church." Still less did he know that "none can deviate from this teaching without the loss of his faith and salvation." From the point of view of the Vatican Council, Polycrates' letter was a wicked act of rebellion, and all the bishops of Asia, by consenting to that act of rebellion, became partakers in their metropolitan's guilt. But the Fathers of the Church were wholly uncon-

¹ The historian Socrates (*H. E.*, v. 22, 16, ed. Hussey, 1853, ii. 626) says that S. Irenaeus "chivalrously inveighed against (*γενναίως κατέδραμεν*) Victor" on this occasion.

² Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 24.

³ *Ep. S. Firmil. inter Cyprianicas*, lxxv. § 6, *Opp.*, ii. 813. See Additional Note 7, p. 438.

⁴ *H. E.*, v. 22.

⁵ Tillemont, iii. 107.

scious of that view of the matter. When S. Jerome writes a short life of Polycrates, he says nothing about rebellion or any other wrong-doing, but quotes the most important part of Polycrates' letter, including his refusal to conform himself to Victor's decision, as a proof of the ability and weight of the man.¹ Moreover, S. Irenaeus, and numbers of other Catholic bishops, took the same view. No doubt they thought that there had been wrong-doing; but in their view, not Polycrates, but Victor was the culprit. They "upbraided" Victor "somewhat sharply." As far as we know, they said nothing to Polycrates. But perhaps for our purpose the most important point to notice is that nobody seems to have supposed that communion with the Catholic Church depended on communion with the Roman see. Victor wrote letters, in which he announced that all the Asian brethren were "*utterly separated from communion.*" It was, of course, in the Roman bishop's power to exclude them from the communion of the Roman Church. In those days it was in the power of every bishop to decide who was to be in the communion of his church, and who was to be excluded. But exclusion from the communion of the Roman Church, though it might *lead* to exclusion from the communion of the Catholic Church, did not necessarily involve such exclusion. Therefore Eusebius tells us that, while Victor (speaking, no doubt, for his own church) announced that the Asians were "*utterly separated from communion,*" he at the same time "*endeavoured to cut them off, as heterodox, from the common unity.*" He *endeavoured*, but he failed in his endeavour. The other bishops objected to Victor's proceeding. They refused to withdraw their communion from Polycrates. He therefore remained united to the common unity of the Catholic Church, although cut off from the communion of the Roman Church. A very important principle underlies this fact. Evidently, in the second century the Church was in no way the born handmaid of the Roman pontiff. The theory set forth in the Vatican decrees was unknown. The Roman Church was not held to be the necessary centre of unity. We may also gather from this whole history that it is a very dangerous thing to attempt to learn the rightful authority of the Roman popes from the claims which they make. The Roman popes, with very few exceptions, have been much too fond of putting forth baseless claims. But the right way of dealing with such claims, if we may judge by the example of S. Irenaeus and other holy bishops of his time, is to inveigh against the claimant fearlessly, and to upbraid him sharply, and to refuse to submit

¹ S. Hieron., *De Viris Illustribus*, cap. xlv.

to his claims. That was how Catholic bishops dealt with Pope Victor in the closing decade of the second century. Evidently either he or his successor learnt a salutary lesson; the abortive excommunication was withdrawn, and after that everything went on as if nothing had happened.

The Witness of S. Irenaeus.

I now pass from the Paschal controversy, in which S. Irenaeus took such a prominent part by opposing the unchristian action of the Roman bishop; and I proceed to consider the famous passage in that same Father's treatise, *Against all heretics*, which Roman Catholics are very fond of quoting, whereas, as I hope to show, it is in reality wholly irreconcilable with the papal claims. S. Irenaeus is exposing the fallaciousness of the arguments used by the Gnostics. They said that their heretical doctrines were derived from the apostles, who delivered them "not in writing but in speech."¹ S. Irenaeus, in reply, appealed "to that tradition which comes from the apostles, and which is guarded by the successions of the presbyters in the churches."² "It is," he says, "within the power of all, who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the world in every church (in omni ecclesia): and we are able to enumerate those whom the apostles appointed to be bishops in the churches, and their successors, quite down to our own time; who neither taught nor knew anything like what these [heretics] rave about. Yet surely, if the apostles had known any hidden mysteries, which they were in the habit of teaching to the perfect apart and privily from the rest, they would have taken special care to deliver them to those, to whom they were also committing the churches themselves; . . . but because it would be too long in such a volume as this to enumerate the successions of all the churches (omnium ecclesiarum), we point to the tradition of that very great and very ancient and universally known church which was founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul;—we point, I say, to the tradition which this church has from the apostles, and to her faith proclaimed to men, which comes down to our time through the succession of her bishops, and so we put to confusion all those who, in whatever sort, either on account of self-pleasing, or of vain glory, or of blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings. For to this church, on account of

¹ S. Irenaeus, III. ii. 1.

² *Ibid.*, III. ii. 2.

its more influential pre-eminence (propter potentiorem principalitatem), it is necessary that every church (omnem ecclesiam) should resort—that is to say, the faithful, who are from all quarters; and in this church (in quâ) the tradition, which comes from the apostles, has ever been preserved by those who are from all quarters.”¹ Unfortunately, the original Greek of this last sentence has not been preserved, but only an ancient Latin translation, which I here subjoin: “Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem² (al. potiorem) principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.”

Before we proceed to investigate the exact meaning of this last sentence and of the various expressions which occur therein, it will be well to consider what is the pith and substance and scope of S. Irenaeus' argument. What he wishes to enforce is, that the teaching of the apostles may be learnt from the public witness of the various apostolic churches, among which there was, at the time when S. Irenaeus wrote (circa 180), complete doctrinal agreement in regard to all the great fundamental points which had to be discussed in the controversy with the Gnostics. He gives reasons for supposing that the first bishops of the apostolic churches were fully instructed by the apostles, who appointed them, in the complete system of apostolic teaching. He further asserts that the catalogues of the names of the various bishops who had succeeded each other in the different apostolic sees, existed in his time, and that it was well known that no one of those bishops had ever taught the heresies maintained by the Gnostics. He argues from these premises that the original teaching, which the apostles were commissioned to promulgate, was not the teaching propagated by the Gnostic bodies. As the apostolic churches were many in number, he thinks it sufficient to make a selection from among them, because an exhaustive investigation of the episcopal catalogues in all of them would take too long. He chooses as his first specimen the primatial Church of Rome, which not only ranked first among all the apostolic churches, but was also the nearest apostolic see to Lyons, and was the church in which in all probability S. Irenaeus

¹ S. Irenaeus, III. iii. 1, 2.

² All the MSS. except one read “potentiorem.” The Cheltenham MS., formerly known as the *Codex Claromontanus*, reads “potiorem,” or rather, if we may trust Dom Massuet, “pontioirem.” It seems better to suppose that two letters have dropped out of the word in one *codex*, than that three letters have been inserted into the word in all the other *codices*. Stieren calls “potentiorem” the “lectio maxime probata.”

had himself received his consecration to the episcopate. We shall see further on that S. Irenaeus points out that the Roman Church, on account of its special pre-eminence, was continually visited by representatives of other churches all over the world, and that this fact constituted an additional guarantee of the purity of its faith. In the section which follows that important statement, he proceeds to give the catalogue of the Roman bishops, from Linus, who received the episcopate from S. Peter and S. Paul, the apostolic founders of the Roman Church, to Eleutherus, who held the bishop's office in Rome at the time when he (S. Irenaeus) was writing. He dwells specially on the witness of S. Clement, because it was manifest from his Epistle to the Corinthians, which was older than the rise of the various Gnostic sects, that the earlier teaching of the Roman Church agreed, not with the Gnostics, but with the teaching of S. Irenaeus' contemporary, Eleutherus; and, since S. Clement had personally known S. Peter and S. Paul, and was surrounded, when he wrote his epistle, by many Christians who had been instructed by them, there was every reason to believe that his teaching, which was, in fact, identical with the teaching of his successors, was also a faithful representation of the teaching of the apostles. Thus the argument against the Gnostics, derivable from the witness of the Roman Church, was very strong, and S. Irenaeus might well say in regard to it, "This is a very full proof (*ostensio*) of the unity and sameness of the life-giving faith, which from the apostles even until now hath been preserved in the Church, and handed down in truth."¹

Having begun with the witness of the apostolic Church of Rome, S. Irenaeus refers next to the witness of the apostolic Church of Smyrna.² He points out that its first bishop, S. Polycarp, had special opportunities of ascertaining the true apostolic tradition of the faith. He had been made a disciple by apostles, and had conversed with many who had seen Christ. It was by the apostles who were in Asia that he was appointed in due time bishop of the Church in Smyrna. All through his long life he had taught the things which he had learnt from the apostles, "which things alone are true." He had finally sealed his faithful teaching by his glorious martyrdom in extreme old age. He had learnt from S. John to have a special horror of holding any communications with heresiarchs. S. Polycarp's teaching may be studied

¹ S. Irenaeus, III. iii. 3.

² Duchesne (*Origines Chrétiennes*, pp. 455, 456) says, "Saint Irénée, dans ses controverses avec les gnostiques, donne une grande importance à l'argument de tradition. La vraie doctrine est pour lui celle qu'enseignent les églises apostoliques; parmi celles-ci la première est l'église de Rome; mais Irénée cite également l'église de Smyrne et la tradition de saint Polycarpe."

in his Epistle to the Philippians; and that same teaching is attested by his successors at Smyrna and by all the other churches in Asia. Such is, in brief, the substance of what S. Irenaeus says about the testimony of the Church in Smyrna.¹

Finally, he refers to the witness of the apostolic Church of Ephesus. That church had also two apostles to found it, viz. S. Paul and S. John. The latter remained at Ephesus until the times of Trajan, who reigned from 98 to 117. As a consequence, the privilege of being instructed by an apostle lasted on in Ephesus much longer than in any other church; and S. Irenaeus assures us that in his own time the Church of Ephesus was a true witness of the apostles' tradition.²

Having referred to the testimony of the three important apostolic churches of Rome, Smyrna, and Ephesus, S. Irenaeus goes on to say, "Since, therefore, we have proofs of such cogency (*tantae ostensiones*), we ought not to seek the truth among others, which it is easy to obtain from the Church."³

It is important to notice that S. Irenaeus' appeal is primarily to the witness of *all* the apostolic churches. At the beginning of the whole argument, he speaks of "the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the world in *every* church," and he declares that he is "able to enumerate those whom the apostles appointed to be bishops in the churches, and their successors, quite down to his own time." And at the end of the argument he says, "For how stands the case? Even though the dispute were but about some ordinary question, would it not be right to recur to the most ancient churches, in which the apostles lived, and to receive from those churches what is certain and clear in regard to the question in hand?" The chief reason which he gives for referring to the testimony of the Roman Church, is that it would take too long to enumerate the successions of the bishops in all the churches. His appeal to Rome is prompted by convenience rather than by any dogmatic reason. At any rate, the motive of convenience drives him to make a selection, and ultimately he in fact selects the churches of Rome, Smyrna, and Ephesus.

It is also very noticeable that in regard to all these three churches, S. Irenaeus takes care to point out all the circumstances of their early history, which would make it probable that the tradition of the faith had been transmitted pure and unaltered from the time of the apostles to the time in which he was writing. The apostolic training of S. Clement of

¹ Cf. S. Irenaeus, III. iii. 4.

² *Ibid.*, III. iii. 4.

³ *Ibid.*, III. iv. 1.

Rome, and of S. Polycarp of Smyrna; the anti-Gnostic teaching of S. Clement's Epistle, which preceded the rise of the great Gnostic leaders; the extreme old age to which S. Polycarp lived, and his hatred of heresy; the length of S. John's sojourn at Ephesus;—these and many other similar details are used by S. Irenaeus to show how probable it is that the apostolic tradition has been faithfully transmitted in the three churches to whose witness he appeals. He knew well that the fact that a church could trace its succession of bishops back to the apostles would not be an absolute guarantee of the purity of its faith,¹ although in the latter part of the second century it would imply a strong presumption of such purity. He therefore takes care to bring forward every corroborative circumstance, which could add strength to his argument. But is it possible to suppose that S. Irenaeus would have patiently enumerated all these corroborative circumstances in the history of the three churches to which he appeals—nay, is it possible to suppose that he would have included in any way the Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus in his appeal, if he had supposed that all churches were bound of necessity to agree in doctrine with the Church of Rome, on the ground that the Bishops of Rome had been endowed with the gift of infallibility? Yet this is the theory which is attributed to S. Irenaeus by Ultramontane controversialists, and in proof of their *thesis* they triumphantly bring forward the celebrated sentence, beginning with the words, "ad hanc enim ecclesiam," which I have quoted on p. 20, and the meaning of which we must now proceed to investigate.

I will begin by giving the translation of the passage which, Dr. Rivington tells us, is "ordinarily adopted by [Roman] Catholic writers"²: "It is necessary that every church, that is, the faithful who are everywhere, should agree

¹ The Church holds that every bishop receives at his consecration, not only the gift of the episcopate, but also a certain enlargement of the presence of the Holy Spirit of Truth, to help him to secure the transmission of the faith without addition and without diminution. S. Paul seems to allude to this gift, when he says to S. Timothy, "That good thing which was committed unto thee *guard through the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us*" (2 Tim. i. 14). S. Irenaeus does not dwell in this passage on that supernatural side of the maintenance of the purity of the faith in the various local churches, but he does appear to refer to it in IV. xxvi. 2, where he speaks of those presbyters "who with the succession of the episcopate have received according to the good pleasure of the Father the *charisma veritatis certum*." To prevent misapprehension, it may be well to add that the Church has never supposed that this gift renders each bishop who receives it infallible. It is a gift which requires at times to be stirred up, if it is to produce its full results. Every bishop needs to take to heart that other admonition of S. Paul to S. Timothy, "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands" (2 Tim. i. 6).

² *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter*, p. 34.

with this church ; in which that tradition which is from the apostles has been preserved by those who are everywhere." Dr. Rivington himself evidently regards this translation as being substantially accurate ; for he says, "The plain and simple meaning, therefore, of S. Irenaeus remains in possession. All churches must agree with the Church of Rome, so that if you know the faith of the Church of Rome you know the faith of the whole Christian Church." ¹ He also says, "If all orthodox churches are *necessarily* found to be in agreement with the Church of Rome, what is this but ascribing infallibility to that Church? This, indeed, is what S. Irenaeus does ascribe to Rome." ² We are not expressly told in the passages quoted above what is the ordinary Roman Catholic translation of the words "propter potentio rem principalitatem ;" but it is clear from the heading which Dr. Rivington has prefixed to his third chapter, and from other passages of his book, that he regards "principalitatem" as equivalent to "sovereignty." ³ I quite agree with Dr. Rivington that, if S. Irenaeus taught that all Christian churches must necessarily agree with the Church of Rome, then S. Irenaeus certainly by implication ascribed to that church the gift of infallibility. But I ask again, How is it possible to suppose that, if that had been his belief, he would have framed his argument against the Gnostics in the way in which he did actually frame it? Could he possibly, on that hypothesis, have mentioned convenience as his principal reason for appealing to the witness of the Roman Church? Is it conceivable that after appealing to the infallible Roman Church he could go on to appeal in a similar way, first to the fallible Church of Smyrna, and then to the fallible Church of Ephesus? In fact, why should he begin and end by a general appeal to all the apostolic churches? The difference between an apostolic church and a non-apostolic church practically disappears, when it is compared with the great gulf which separates an infallible sovereign church from a fallible subject church. And if the faith taught by the Bishops of Rome was always infallibly orthodox, why take the trouble to enumerate corroborative details in the history of the transmission of the apostolic tradition not only in the Church of Rome, but in the Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus? Indeed, it may not be too much to say that, apart from any investigation of the meaning of the particular expressions used by S. Irenaeus, we may set aside as absolutely out of the question any interpretation of the passage, which plainly implies that the Church of

¹ *Prim. Church*, p. 38.

² *Ibid.*, p. 37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 32 ; compare pp. 58, 59.

Rome or the Bishops of Rome were endowed with the gift of infallibility.

And when we come to investigate the meaning of the particular expressions used, we find, as we should expect to find, a very complete confirmation of the conclusion at which we have arrived.

Let us begin by considering what is the true meaning of the phrase "convenire ad." Does S. Irenaeus mean to say that it is necessary that every church should *agree with* the Church of Rome? or that every church should *resort to* the Church of Rome? The Italian Jesuit Perrone, quoting and adopting the comment of Dom Massuet, rejects the second of these two interpretations as *absurdissimum*;¹ and with Perrone and Massuet in their rejection of that interpretation agree the greater number of Ultramontane writers, and some Gallicans.

However, I am thankful to see that Messrs. Wilhelm and Scannell, in their *Manual of Catholic Theology*, which is based on Scheeben's *Dogmatik*, and to which is prefixed a commendatory preface by the late Cardinal Manning, adopt the rendering "resort to."² And the very learned Roman Catholic historian, Dr. F. X. Funk, writing in 1882, tells us that "within the last few years," the translation "resort to" has begun "to meet with more acceptance, even in [Roman] Catholic circles."³ Dr. Funk himself, after elaborately discussing the ordinary Roman Catholic translation of the whole sentence, and showing to what absurdity it leads,⁴ says, "Under these circumstances there remains no other course than to abandon the traditional translation of 'convenire,' which is the sole cause of the above-cited absurdity."⁵ He ends up by accepting the rendering "resort to."⁶

But the fact is that the translation "agree with" not only involves the whole sentence in absurdity, as Dr. Funk points

¹ *Prælectiones Theologicae*, ed. 1841, ii. 425.

² *Manual of Catholic Theology*, ed. 1890, i. 28.

³ *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 738.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 738-743.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 743.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 744. There have been earlier writers of the Roman communion who have seen that *convenire ad* in this passage means "resort to." Among those that might be mentioned, I will name only the illustrious Thomassinus (*Traité des Édits, et des autres moyens pour maintenir l'Unité de l'Église Catholique*, ed. 1703, tom. i. p. 37), and Waterworth (*Faith of Catholics*, ed. 1846, vol. i. p. 253), and R. J. Wilberforce (*Principles of Church Authority*, p. 134, written when the author was passing from the Anglican into the Roman communion), and even Bishop Bonner (*Homilies*, ed. 1555, p. 50). I owe this last reference to a kind communication from the Rev. S. Phillips, the Honorary Secretary of the Church Historical Society. Finally, Newman, in his essay on *Development* (ed. 1885, p. 157), mentions both interpretations, viz. *resort to* and *agree with*, but gives precedence to the former of the two.

out, but it is itself, as a translation, and apart from the context, most improbable. I find that the word *convenire* is used in the Vulgate one hundred and eleven times. In ninety-seven places it means "resort to" or "assemble;" and in ten places it is translated in the Douay Version, "agree with," usually in the sense of making a bargain or agreement with another person. It is clear, therefore, that the more common meaning of *convenire* is to "resort to." But the point can be pressed more closely home. I find that in twenty-six passages the verb *convenire* is followed by the preposition *ad*, and in every one of these passages "*convenire ad*" means "*to resort to*," or, more accurately, "*come together to*."¹ It would perhaps be rash to lay down a universal negative, and to say that "*convenire ad*" never means "agree with;" but, as far as I am aware, no such passage has ever yet been produced. The normal meaning of the expression is undoubtedly "to resort to," and the *onus probandi* lies on those who teach that in this passage of S. Irenaeus it ought to be understood in an abnormal way. Passages can, no doubt, be found in the works of Latin authors in which "*convenire cum*" is to be understood in the sense of "agree with;" but we have to do here with the expression "*convenire ad*," and not with the expression "*convenire cum*." It is amusing and instructive to notice that Perrone, on one occasion, makes a slip in quoting the passage with which we are dealing, and substitutes *cum* for *ad*.²

There are several touches in the wording of the passage which we are considering, which corroborate the view of the meaning of "*convenire ad*" which I am urging. When S. Irenaeus says that it is necessary that every church should resort to the Church of Rome, he feels that some explanation is needed, because it is physically impossible that every church in the world should assemble in one city, however great. He, therefore, glosses the expression "*omnem ecclesiam*," and adds, "*hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles*." This gloss would have been quite superfluous if "*convenire ad*" had meant "agree with." It is easy to see how every church can *agree with* another church; there is need of an

¹ It has been suggested that the original Greek expression used by S. Irenaeus, which has been translated *convenire ad*, was *συμβαλεῖν πρὸς*. But can any instance be cited from ancient Latin translations of Greek authors in which *convenire ad* is given as the translation of *συμβαλεῖν πρὸς*? Certainly no instance of such a rendering occurs in the Bible. In twelve passages *convenire ad* in the Vulgate corresponds with *συνάγεσθαι* or *ἐπισυνάγεσθαι*, usually followed by *πρὸς*, once by *ἐπὶ*. In other cases various Greek expressions, such as *ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς*, *συνέρχεσθαι πρὸς*, *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς*, *συνπορεύεσθαι πρὸς*, κ.τ.λ., are the Greek equivalents of *convenire ad*. I refer the reader to the Additional Note 8, p. 439, for a discussion of the true meaning of the expression *conventio ad* in 2 Cor. vi. 15, and of its bearing on the interpretation of the Irenaean passage.

² *Praelectt. Theoll.*, ii. 408.

interpretation when we are told that it is necessary that every church should *resort to* another church, and accordingly an interpretation is given. S. Irenaeus tells us that, when he says "every church," he means "the faithful from all quarters." They are in the habit of resorting to Rome, and in them the local churches, to which they belong, may be said to resort thither.

Again, if S. Irenaeus had meant to say that it is necessary that every church should *agree with* the Church of Rome, it would have been more natural, when he came to explain what he meant by "every church," to have used the word *ubique* rather than *undique*. *Agreement with* the Church at Rome in no way implies any need to journey thither. Christians could *agree*, remaining where they were, scattered everywhere (*ubique*). But S. Irenaeus uses *undique*, which, when taken in its ordinary meaning,¹ seems to denote the normal situation of their various homes, with an implied contrast with their present place of sojourning. The *primâ facie* meaning of *undique* is "from all quarters," not "everywhere."² It is most natural that the idea conveyed by *undique* should occur in a sentence in which *convenire ad* also occurs;³ for, as we have seen, the true meaning of *convenire ad* implies a journey, and so a change of location. The faithful from all quarters came to Rome; and they necessarily brought with them, written on their hearts and memories, the apostolic tradition of the faith, which each had learnt in his own local church. Thus in Rome, as in other great ecclesiastical centres, but in Rome more especially on account of its pre-eminent position, the tradition of the faith was not only preserved by the local church—that is, by the local clergy and laity, headed by their bishop—but there was an inflow of Christians from all the other churches in the world, and the tradition of the faith was found to be everywhere one, and so the apostolic tradition was preserved with much security in the great metropolitical

¹ My friend, the Rev. F. E. Brightman, kindly supplies me with a few passages taken from one short section of the seventh book of the Aeneid, which illustrate the way in which *undique* naturally connects itself with verbs of convergent motion. Verg. *Aen.* vii. 520: "raptis concurrunt undique telis;" *Aen.* vii. 551: "undique ut auxilio veniant;" *Aen.* vii. 582: "undique collecti coeunt, Martemque fatigant."

² I grant that *undique* in some exceptional passages means much the same as *ubique*, but nevertheless, as Funk observes (*Hist.-pol. Blätter*, lxxxix. 744, note), "The strict interpretation of *undique* has the preference."

³ As illustrating this combination of *undique* with *convenire ad* in the same sentence, one may compare S. Mark i. 45, where we are told (R. V.) that "Jesus could no more openly enter into a city, but was without in desert places: and they came to Him from every quarter" ("et conveniebant ad eum undique"—Vulg.). However, it is fair to point out that in this verse of S. Mark, *undique* is more closely combined with *convenire ad* than is the case in the passage from S. Irenaeus. See also the Additional Note 9, p. 440.

centres,¹ but above all in the chief centre at Rome, by those who came thither from all quarters.² If at any time a heretical bishop, or a bishop who was ready to communicate with heretics, should occupy the see of a great centre like Rome, as actually happened in regard to the Roman chair in the case of Felix II. (A.D. 356) for some time after his consecration, and again in the case of Liberius for some time after his return to Rome from exile, the orthodox nucleus of the local church would be lacking, and the mere conflux of Christians from all quarters would have very little, if any, effect in keeping the faith pure. But given a Catholic local church, its grasp of the faith would be strengthened and its conception of it would be enriched by the presence of representatives of distant churches, holding substantially the same faith, but doing sometimes fuller justice to particular aspects of it, which might be more familiar to the distant churches, in which they had been nurtured, than to the great metropolitan church in which they were sojourning. Thus we can see how at Rome and other great centres, but pre-eminently at Rome, local exaggeration or one-sidedness would be warded off by the fact that all churches were present there in the persons of those of their members who had occasion to resort thither. On the other hand, the faithful *everywhere* (*ubique*) scattered over the world could not preserve the apostolic

¹ Cardinal Newman, in his *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical* (ed. 1874, p. 216), uses language of synods which is true also of great churches. Newman says, "When a certain number of men meet together, one of them corrects another, and what is personal and peculiar in each, what is local or belongs to schools, is eliminated." Compare also a passage in the *Revue Biblique* for October, 1894 (p. 556), in which the Barnabite, Father Séméria, adopting the words of the Abbé Lejay, contrasts the security of tradition in a great church like that of Antioch with its relative insecurity in a small church like that of Rhossus.

² It is worth noting that Roman controversialists, in quoting the Irenaeum passage, sometimes omit the words "ab his qui sunt undique." For example, Father Lockhart omits them in the *Old Religion*, pp. 30, 31 (3rd ed.). No one would accuse Father Lockhart of omitting important words intentionally, but one may fairly suppose that he habitually thought of the passage apart from those words. There is an office for the feast of S. Irenaeus in the appendix to the Roman Breviary; and the passage about the Roman Church is quoted in the sixth lesson at Mattins; but the whole of the last clause is omitted, so that a completely erroneous impression of S. Irenaeus' teaching is conveyed. Père Gratry of the Oratory, in the second of his celebrated letters to Mgr. Dechamps of Malines, animadverted severely but justly on the wrongness of dealing in such a manner with such a passage. Fénelon, in his Dissertation, *De Summi Pontificis Auctoritate* (cap. x., *Œuvres*, ed. 1848, tome ii. pp. 15, 16), quotes the whole passage at the beginning of his chapter; but in the course of his exposition of its meaning he never once alludes to the words, "ab his qui sunt undique." In the many conciliar decrees and papal briefs, contained in the fourth volume of the *Collectio Lacensis*, in which this passage is quoted, in not one single case is the citation given in an un mutilated form. The nearest approach to integrity is reached by Pope Pius VII. in his brief, *Ex quo*, addressed to the assembly of bishops at Paris in 1811; but even Pius omits, without giving any warning, the crucial words, "ab his qui sunt undique." Cf. *Collect. Lacensis*, iv. 1319.

tradition in the Roman Church (*in quâ*).¹ They could preserve it in their own churches. But S. Irenaeus says that they preserved it *in the Roman Church*; and that they could only do by resorting thither. Thus it will be seen that, on the interpretation which I am trying to justify, all the expressions in the sentence fit in with each other, and throw light on each other.

But the question has still to be considered—How did it come to pass that the faithful from all quarters resorted to the Church of Rome? S. Irenaeus says that it was “*propter potentio rem principalitatem.*” It would seem to be implied that other apostolic and metropolitical churches possessed a *principalitas*, but that the Church of Rome possessed a *potentior principalitas*. Now *principalitas*, as Forcellini in his edition of Facciolati’s great dictionary tells us, means “the first place” (“*princeps seu primus locus*”). It is a substantive derived from the adjective *principalis*, which, as we learn from the same authority, is equivalent in its meaning to “*primus.*” Strictly speaking, the substantive, *principalitas*, connotes *firstness* or *primacy*. Whether any particular primacy, which may be under consideration, is a primacy not only of honour and influence, but also of jurisdiction, must be learnt from such sources of information as may be within our reach. The word itself does not settle the question either way. In this respect it resembles the root word *princeps*, from which it is ultimately derived. At Rome

¹ Messrs. Addis and Arnold (*Catholic Dictionary*, ed. New York, 1887, p. 673, note 3, s.v. “Pope”) translate the Irenaeian passage thus: “For with this Church, because of its more powerful principality, every church must agree—that is, the faithful everywhere—in which (*i.e.* in communion with the Roman Church) the tradition of the apostles has ever been preserved by those everywhere.” This interpretation is open to many objections. It deserts the natural interpretation of *convenire ad*, and gives to that phrase a meaning which is either impossible or highly improbable. It also deserts the natural meaning of *undique*; and, finally, it deserts the natural meaning of *in quâ*. The writer of the article in a note says, “‘In qua,’ ‘in which’—*i.e.* ‘in union with which,’ or ‘in the unity of which.’” This is surely a very strained explanation. The writer feels the necessity of justifying his suggestion, and quotes three passages in order to do so. He says, “Cf. ‘Salutem in eo dedit’ (III. 12. 4); ‘Quod perdidideramus in Adam’ (III. 18. 1); and ‘In qua una cathedra [sc. Petri] unitas ab omnibus servaretur’ (Optat. *Schism. Don.*, ii. 2).” In the two passages cited from S. Irenaeus the preposition “in” preserves its natural meaning. God gave salvation *in* Christ; and we lost *in* Adam the image of God. But the faithful everywhere are not *in* the local Church of Rome, except so far as they resort thither. The passages quoted from S. Irenaeus do not justify the proposed meaning of “in.” The passage from S. Optatus is more to the writer’s purpose, but it supplies an example of a most unusual meaning of “in,” a meaning not to be adopted in other passages except under the stress of absolute necessity. I do not think that it is necessary that I should do more than mention the theory of some expounders of the passage, who connect “*in quâ*” with “*omnem ecclesiam.*” As Dr. Funk points out (*Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 742), such a construction involves an “intolerable tautology.” Dom Chapman also describes it as “très dure” (*Revue Bénédicte* for February, 1895, p. 59), and rejects it; and it is repudiated by Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Church*, pp. 37, 38).

the *princeps juventutis* and the *princeps Senatus* had no jurisdiction over the youth or over the Senate. The titles implied precedence and nothing more. Even the Roman emperor did not get his title of "*princeps*" because of his jurisdiction, but rather in spite of it. Professor H. F. Pelham, speaking of the title *princeps*, as accorded to Augustus and his successors, says, "It did not connote the tenure of any special office or prerogative. . . . It was a title of courtesy pure and simple, marking out its bearer as the 'first citizen' (*princeps civium*, Mommsen, *Staatsr.*, ii. 733, note 3), or rather as the 'foremost man of the state' (*princeps civitatis* . . .), and implied not only a general pre-eminence, as distinct from a specific magisterial authority, . . . but a constitutional pre-eminence among free citizens as opposed to despotic rule."¹ The same writer, discussing in another place this same title of *Princeps*, as applied to the Roman emperor, says, "To this high dignitary belonged special powers, and therefore special titles—he was emperor, consul, etc. ; but to describe his general relation to the whole citizen body, as merely the first of themselves, no term was so suitable as that of 'princeps.'"²

I am, of course, in no way intending to imply that the *principalitas* of the Roman see or of the other apostolic sees was necessarily analogous to the *principatus* of the Roman emperors. All that I wish to assert is that the word itself simply implies *firstness*, and that the nature of the *firstness* and the prerogatives attaching to it must be learnt from the general witness of the history of the early Church. But the fact that S. Irenaeus seems to imply that not only the Roman see but also other sees had a *principalitas*³ is a fact of very great importance. Ephesus was no doubt the *ecclesia principalis* in Asia ; Antioch in Syria and Cilicia ; Alexandria with

¹ *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 3rd edit., vol. ii. pp. 483, 484, s.v. *Princeps*.

² *Journal of Philology*, vol. viii. p. 332. On the meaning of *principalitas* compare Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian* (appendix A, pp. 537-540).

³ Dom Chapman, O.S.B., in the *Revue Bénédictine* for February, 1895 (p. 56), says that in Harnack's opinion "évidemment *principalitas* doit être un attribut commun à toutes les églises apostoliques, tandis que *potentior* explique que cet attribut est possédé d'une manière supérieure par l'Église de Rome." This conclusion is based on the comparative *potentior*, since the comparative normally implies a comparison. Dom Chapman himself adds, "Je concède qu'il est plus naturel de donner au comparatif sa valeur ordinaire." On the fact that a *principalitas* or *primatus* belonged to all the principal sees of Christendom, one may compare the title of the sixth Nicene canon, as it is given in the Latin version used at Carthage in 419, and sometimes, though, as I think, wrongly, ascribed to Caecilian of Carthage. In that version that title runs thus: "De primatibus, qui ad quasdam pertinent civitates" (Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande*, p. 905). Reference is made in the canon to the pre-eminence and prerogatives of the churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, in their respective regions, and in provinces outside those regions to the privileges of the metropolitan church.

great powers in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; Carthage in Africa; and finally Rome, with considerable authority in Italy, and with a less authoritative pre-eminence in other parts of the West. Each of these sees had not only a *principalitas* making it pre-eminent among the churches of its own region, and giving it a certain initiative and even in some cases a certain jurisdiction over them; but they also in varying degrees exercised *influence (potentia)* throughout the whole Church.¹ But the Church of Rome, being not only an apostolic church like the Churches of Ephesus and Antioch, but being also the church of the great metropolis of the whole civilized world, had enjoyed, ever since the destruction of Jerusalem, or at any rate ever since the death of the last apostle, a primacy among primatial churches, and had possessed a more effective and more frequently exercised influence than any of them. While all of these great churches enjoyed an influential primacy, a *potens principalitas*, Rome enjoyed a more influential primacy, a *potentior principalitas*.² As I have already said, in all organized bodies the highest person is most often made a referee or arbitrator, simply because he is highest.³ So again, when concerted action is needed, it seems most natural for the highest person to take the initiative in suggesting appropriate measures. It is natural for the Archbishop of Canterbury to invite the bishops of the Anglican communion to conferences at Lambeth. It was natural for Victor of Rome to invite the various primates and metropolitans throughout the Church to convoke their provincial synods with a view to the settlement of the Paschal controversy. After Pope Liberius' fall it was natural for S. Athanasius, as the occupant of the second see in Christendom, to summon a council at Alexandria which might determine on the line of action which was to be pursued towards bishops and others, who had been contaminated by communion with Arians, and

¹ By way of illustration I will quote a passage from a letter of S. Basil to S. Athanasius. S. Basil says (*Ep.* lxvi. § 2, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 159, 160), "No one knows better than you do, that, like all wise physicians, you ought to begin your treatment in the most vital parts, and what part is more vital to the churches throughout the world (*ταῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίαις*) than Antioch? Only let Antioch be restored to harmony, and nothing will stand in the way of her supplying, as a healthy head, soundness to all the body." Any one who has studied the writings of papalist controversialists, will know how such a passage would be quoted and requoted, if it referred to Rome instead of to Antioch. But the passage illustrates in another way the statement made in the text. Not only was the influence of Antioch great throughout the churches of the whole world, but the Bishop of Alexandria, who had no jurisdiction over Antioch, is implored to use his influence so as to restore the Church of Antioch to harmony. It is evident that the primacy of these great sees was potent outside the sphere of their jurisdiction. For a very remarkable instance of the world-wide influence of Alexandria, see the account of the Council of Alexandria of the year 362, which is given on pp. 259-274.

² See the Additional Note 10, p. 440.

³ See p. 9.

to invite the rest of the Catholic episcopate to follow the lead which he had given. Instances of initiative such as these do not imply jurisdiction; they imply *firstness*, and pre-eminent influence resulting from *firstness*. Again, there can be no doubt that the various apostolic sees were continually being consulted on doubtful points. I have already quoted a passage from S. Irenaeus in which he implies as much. But who can doubt that among them all the primatial see of Rome was consulted with very much the greatest frequency? From the nature of the case, it must have been so. From one cause or another the various bishops of Christendom were perpetually corresponding with each other, and especially with the bishops who occupied metropolitan sees, and still more especially with those who occupied apostolic sees. But the correspondence with the see of Rome must have been enormously greater than the correspondence with any other see in the world. All important events and movements of thought affecting the Church would be sure to be communicated to the Roman Bishop;¹ he would be often asked to arbitrate, still more often to advise; and when he initiated any concerted course of action, replies to his invitations would be sent to Rome. Now it must be remembered that in the early Church letters on ecclesiastical business were not sent by the public post. They were conveyed by duly accredited persons, who were nearly always ecclesiastics. The messengers of the churches were sometimes bishops, sometimes priests, sometimes deacons, sometimes clergymen in minor orders. There must, therefore, have been continually present in Rome a vast number of accredited representatives of churches and provinces situated in different parts of the world.² No doubt there were also similar assemblages of representatives of other churches at Ephesus, Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage, etc., but at Rome the representation of the whole Church would be far more complete, because it was not only an *ecclesia principalis*, but its *principalitas* was more influential (*potentior*) than that of any other great church.

¹ Professor Ramsay (*S. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 346) says, "All movements of thought throughout the Empire acted with marvellous rapidity on Rome, the heart of the vast and complicated organism." Compare Dr. Robertson's note in the *Church Historical Society's Lectures*, series ii, p. 219. What was true of movements of thought in general, was true in particular of movements of thought among Christians.

² Besides these accredited representatives of the various churches of Christendom, other distinguished Christians came from time to time to Rome to investigate the Christian tradition in the greatest of the apostolic churches, or for other reasons. One may mention S. Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, Abercius Marcellus, S. Polycarp, Rhodon, and S. Irenaeus himself, who all came to Rome during the second century, and some of them, while there, gave public instructions in the Christian religion.

Thus we can see how, from the nature of the case, it *necessarily* came to pass (as S. Irenaeus says, "*necesse est*") that every church should resort to Rome in the persons of trustworthy representatives, on account of the *potentior principalitas*¹ of the Roman see, and we can easily imagine how, in consequence of this ecumenical representation of the various provinces of the Church, the apostolic tradition of the faith would be preserved at Rome in all its many-sidedness and freshness, with special fulness of security.² One result of this state of things would be that, when appeal was made to the witness of the apostolic churches, and when, to save time, it was thought well to take two or three representative churches as specimens, the testimony of the primatial Church of Rome would naturally be put in the forefront, and be invoked first of all.

In a clever article which appeared in the *Revue Bénédictine* for February 1895, the author, Dom Chapman, expresses his opinion that this passage of S. Irenaeus, in whatever way it be translated, remains under all circumstances a full and complete proof of the tradition which modern Roman Catholics believe to have been committed to the Church by the apostles, namely, "that Rome is the centre of the Church and the infallible throne of the truth."³ That in the time of S. Irenaeus the see of Rome was as a matter of fact the first see in the Catholic Church is a position which is absolutely unassailable; but that any educated person should suppose that S. Irenaeus' words prove that he held as an apostolic tradition that the see of Rome is the infallible throne of the truth, is to me a most astounding phenomenon.⁴ I have

¹ The reader is referred to the Additional Note II on p. 441 for a discussion of the question, What was the Greek word used by S. Irenaeus, which has in this passage been translated *principalitas*?

² The Jesuit Perrone (*De Vera Religione*, pars poster. § 56, *Praelectiones Theologicae*, ed. 1840, vol. i. pp. 244, 245) observes very truly: "Apostoli acceptam a Christo revelationem consignarunt vel singularibus individuis, episcopis scilicet, vel particularibus ecclesiis quas instituerunt, et ad quas identidem etiam scripserunt; nec totam insuper, atque, ut ita dicam, in solido revelationem singulis ad instar unius doctrinae corporis tradiderunt, sed prout occasio ferebat, exceptis articulis explicite necessario ab omnibus credendis, eam proponebant, prout colligitur ex I Cor. iii. 1, 2, et alibi passim. Hinc non potuit statim constare singulis episcopis vel ecclesiis particularibus, ex quibus ecclesia universalis coalescit, de iis quae apostoli sive viva voce, sive scriptis singularibus vel episcopis vel ecclesiis commiserunt. Inde ortae quandoque vel excitatae controversiae sive circa numerum librorum canonicorum, sive circa veritatem aliquorum traditionum, sive demum circa legitimum sensum quorundam scripturae locorum, donec collatis suffragiis ecclesia universa divina ope suffulta de eis determinaverit seu iudicium tulerit."⁵

³ Dom Chapman says (*Revue Bénédictine*, année xii. p. 64): "Je pense que j'en ai dit assez pour montrer à un catholique que ce texte de S. Irénée, de quelque manière qu'on le traduise, reste toujours une preuve pleine et entière de cette tradition que nous croyons avoir reçue des Apôtres, que Rome est le centre de l'Église et le siège infallible de la vérité."

⁴ I rejoice to read in an article which appeared in the *Dublin Review* for

already pointed out how the whole construction of S. Irenaeus' argument in the first four chapters of his third book contradicts any such notion. But now, limiting myself to this particular passage, I ask, How could the holy writer avoid making any reference to the infallibility of the pope if he himself believed in that infallibility, when he was dilating on the securities for the preservation of the apostolic tradition of the faith in the Church at large, and specially in the Church of Rome? For that is the point on which S. Irenaeus has his eye. He is giving reasons why he enumerates the succession of the Roman bishops rather than the succession of the bishops of other churches, as guaranteeing that the apostolic teaching has been continuously handed down. His reasons must seem very tame to those who believe in the Vatican decrees. They would say that by a divine promise the see of S. Peter remains always unharmed by any error, and that the definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not through any consent of the Church.¹ They would therefore point the poor Gnostic wanderer² to that infallible fountain of truth which God has established in the see of Rome. But S. Irenaeus is able to offer no such comfort. He refers first to the various churches all over the world as manifesting the apostolic tradition. Then, to save time, he selects three of the apostolic churches as specimens of the rest; and first of all he refers with special emphasis to the very great and very ancient Roman Church, and he says that to it, because of its more influential primacy, the faithful come flocking in from all quarters, and that the apostolic tradition is preserved in the

April, 1899 (vol. cxxiv. p. 383), the following sentence: "With all deference to those who think otherwise, we fail to see how it can be maintained that Irenaeus is appealing to a Magisterium, or to any right to decide upon disputed points, possessed by the Roman Church." It is precisely an infallible *Magisterium*, which is claimed for the pope in the Vatican decree on papal infallibility. The title of that decree is thus worded: "De Romani pontificis infallibili magisterio" (*Collect. Lacens.*, vii. 485). And this infallible Magisterium is, as a rule, pre-eminently claimed for him in his capacity as the supreme *Judex controversiarum*, or, in other words, as being the person who in a special sense has the "right to decide upon disputed points." It follows that the *Dublin Review* would regard Dom Chapman's conclusion as an illegitimate deduction from S. Irenaeus' words. The author of the *Dublin Review* article, from which I have been quoting, is Father Bacchus of the Birmingham Oratory. He is referring to the particular passage of S. Irenaeus which I have been discussing in this lecture.

¹ "Omnes venerabiles Patres . . . et sancti Doctores orthodoxi . . . plenissime scientes hanc Sancti Petri sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri pollicitationem." "Docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus . . . Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse" (*Constit. Dogmat. Prim. de Ecclesia Christi*, cap. iv., promulgated by Pius IX. at the Vatican Council; cf. *Collect. Lacens.*, vii. 486, 487).

² It is important to notice that one purpose of S. Irenaeus throughout this argument is to bring back the Gnostics "ad conversionem veritatis" (cf. III. ii. 3).

Roman Church—by whom? by the infallible pope? No! by these Christians who have come to Rome from the other local churches. Further on he appeals to the witness of the apostolic Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus. From an Ultramontane point of view this is truly a tame argument; so tame that we may be quite certain that S. Irenaeus knew nothing about papal infallibility. And if he knew nothing about it, that means that S. Polycarp had taught him nothing about it; and that, again, means that S. Polycarp had learnt nothing about it from St. John. So far from this Irenaeian passage being a full and complete proof of the apostolicity of the doctrine, that infallibility is to be ascribed to the Roman Church, it is a full and complete proof of the opposite *thesis*. Yet the author of the article "Pope," in Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, says: "The most important testimony to the authority of Rome in the first ages of the Church is that of Irenaeus;" and then he proceeds to quote the passage which we have been considering, and he quotes no other.¹

¹ Ed. New York, 1887, p. 672.

LECTURE II.

THE SEE OF ROME IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.—II.

The Theory that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome—The Clementine Romance—S. Cyprian's Witness.

WE have seen that the honour and influence attaching to an apostolic see was shared by the Church of Rome with other apostolic churches; but that from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or, at any rate, from the time of the death of S. John, the position of Rome as the metropolis of the civilized world had necessarily secured for the Roman Church a certain pre-eminence and primacy among the other apostolic churches. Both the second and the fourth of the Ecumenical Councils allude to this primacy, and by implication in the one case, and by direct assertion in the other, trace its origin to the fact that Rome was the imperial city. There can, I think, be no doubt that these two Ecumenical Councils give a true account of the matter. But it must be admitted that as early as the first half of the third century we find in the West traces of a tendency to attribute the primatial position of the Roman Church to a totally different cause. Some Western writers of the third century held the view that S. Peter had been the first Bishop of Rome, that he had died while still in the occupation of the Roman see, and that he had left his own leadership among the apostolic rulers of the Church as a legacy to his successors in the Roman chair. In later centuries this view penetrated from the West to the East, though it did not ultimately prevail there. It persisted, however, in the West throughout the Middle Ages, and it is maintained at the present day by Roman controversialists as the vitally necessary basis for the claims of the papacy.¹ It will be well, therefore, before we

¹ For example, Professor Jungmann of Louvain, in his *Dissertationes Selectae in Hist. Eccl.* (tom. i. p. 28, ed. 1880), says, "Quod igitur *Episcopi Romani* B. Petro succedant pendet ex aliquibus factis. (1) Quod B. Petrus tenuerit Romanum Episcopatum, et quidem (2) usque ad mortem; quod (3) ante mortem non resignaverit alteri suam oecumenicam potestatem; quod (4) jus et potestatem suam sedi Romanae reliquerit. . . . Ex dictis satis colligitur, quanti momenti illa sit quaestio *de sede Romana Petri*. Convenit autem advertere, veritatem hujus facti, scilicet Episcopatus Romani B. Petri, certam esse certitudine infallibilitatis."

pass on to the third century and to the history of S. Cyprian, to investigate the truth or falsehood of this Petrine theory. We shall find, I think, that there is reason for supposing that the date of its origination is later than the time of S. Irenaeus.

We have seen, in fact, that S. Irenaeus, when heaping up reasons for appealing, in the first place, to the witness of the Roman Church against the Gnostics, says nothing about any devolution of primacy from S. Peter to the Bishops of Rome. It is difficult to believe that, if he had held the theory which asserts that there was such a devolution, he would not have referred to it, and, in fact, placed it in the forefront of his argument, where it would have had a cogency and a clinching force of a far higher order than attaches to any of the reasonings which he actually uses. He does, indeed, refer to S. Peter in connexion with the Church of Rome; but all that he says is that S. Peter and S. Paul were joint founders of that Church, which is a very different thing from saying that S. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and that he retained his bishopric until his death, and that he left his supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church to his successors in the Roman see. The context of the whole passage is such that we may fairly argue that S. Irenaeus' silence about S. Peter's Roman episcopate implies that he did not believe that the apostle had ever held that episcopate. And this result is confirmed by other passages in which S. Irenaeus teaches that, in fact, S. Linus was the first Roman bishop. Thus in III. iii. 3 he writes as follows: "The blessed apostles [Peter and Paul], having founded and builded the [Roman] Church, committed the ministry of the episcopate to Linus . . . and his successor is Anencletus: and after him, *in the third place from the apostles*, the bishopric is allotted to Clement." After mentioning the fourth and fifth bishops, Evaristus and Alexander, S. Irenaeus goes on to say, "Then Xystus in like manner is appointed *sixth from the apostles*." Then he mentions, in due order, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, and adds, "The bishop's office is now held *in the twelfth place from the apostles* by Eleutherus." Here the numbering seems to suggest that S. Linus was held to have been the first bishop. It may, indeed, be maintained that S. Irenaeus' words do not absolutely exclude the theory that the episcopate was first held jointly by S. Peter and S. Paul; but the notion of a joint episcopate, though suggested by S. Epiphanius, contradicts the ordinary Western tradition from the third century onwards; and if S. Irenaeus had believed that S. Peter and S. Paul were joint-bishops, it is difficult to account for his silence about such an important

fact. It ought also to be noticed that the Petrine theory requires us to hold that S. Peter *died* Bishop of Rome; but here we have S. Irenaeus assuring us that S. Peter and S. Paul, during their lifetime, committed the episcopate to Linus. No stress could be laid on this point, if Linus' consecration immediately preceded the martyrdom of the two apostles; but we have no certainty that such was the fact, and it does not seem to have formed any part of the later Roman tradition on the subject. For in the *Liber Pontificalis* S. Linus is said to have commenced his episcopate when Saturninus and Scipio were consuls, that is to say, in the year 56, which was several years before the death of S. Peter. And Dr. Rivington himself asserts that "there is nothing unreasonable" in the view adopted by Rufinus, namely, that "Linus and Cletus were . . . bishops in the city of Rome . . . during the lifetime of Peter . . . so that they bore the care of the episcopate, whilst he fulfilled the office of the apostolate."¹

But to go back to the numbering of the Roman bishops. There is another passage in which S. Irenaeus speaks still more clearly than in the passages previously cited. In III. iv. 3 he says that Marcion "flourished under Anicetus, *who occupied the tenth place in the episcopate.*" Here there is no reference to the apostles. Anicetus occupies absolutely the tenth place in the list of bishops. Yet, if the apostles are to be reckoned among the bishops, Anicetus' place is the eleventh, and not the tenth.

In the very same paragraph S. Irenaeus speaks of "Hyginus, *who was eighth bishop,*" for such is the reading in the old Latin version: "Sub Hygino, qui fuit *octavus* episcopus." Eusebius quotes the passage in Greek, and reads *ἔνατος*;² but there can be no doubt, I think, that S. Irenaeus wrote *ὄγδοος* and not *ἔνατος*. Between Hyginus and Anicetus came Pius; and it is hardly possible to suppose that in the same paragraph, and within the space of six lines, two different methods of numbering the Roman bishops can have been used. If Anicetus was the tenth, then Hyginus was the eighth; and the Latin translation has preserved the true reading. Bishop Lightfoot holds that "certainly" in this passage *ἔνατος* is "a later emendation, so as to include the episcopate of Peter."³ There is one other Irenaeian passage (viz. I. xxvii. 1.), which is quoted by Eusebius in the same chapter of his history as the one in which he cites the passage which I have just been discussing. In this place also reference is made to Hyginus, and according to Eusebius' reading

¹ *Prim. Church*, p. 24.

² *H. E.*, iv. 11.

³ *S. Clement of Rome*, i. 204, note.

he is said to occupy "the *ninth* place in the episcopal succession from the apostles." Here the apostles are mentioned, and the fact that they are mentioned shows that *ἐνατον* has been substituted for *ὄγδοον*.¹ For even if we granted that Hyginus might be described as the ninth Roman bishop, he certainly was not the ninth bishop in succession *from the apostles*.² Yet the corruption of the text goes back as far as to the time of S. Cyprian,³ and it has affected all the extant manuscript copies of the old Latin translation.⁴ They all read "nonum." Dom Massuet, the Benedictine editor of S. Irenaeus, and Stieren, following him, have rightly substituted "octavum" for "nonum."

Thus it seems clear that S. Irenaeus, while he regarded S. Peter and S. Paul as the apostolic founders of the Church of Rome, did not consider that either of them was to be reckoned among the bishops of the city.⁵ Linus was, in his view, the first bishop. This conclusion, so far as it affects the two apostles, is corroborated, when we notice that it is true not only of S. Irenaeus, but also of Tertullian; though Tertullian makes Clement and not Linus the first of the Roman bishops. Tertullian is speaking about the various heretical sects, and he says, "Let them produce the original records of their churches; let them unroll the catalogue of their bishops, so running down in due succession from the beginning, that that [much venerated] first bishop of theirs (*ut primus ille episcopus*) may appear to have had for his ordainer (*auctor*) and predecessor some one of the apostles or of the apostolic men; I, of course, refer to apostolic men who continued stedfastly with the apostles. For it is in this manner that the apostolic churches give an account of their beginnings; ⁶ as for instance, the Church of Smyrna relates

¹ It is a pleasure to be able to record the fact that Cardinal Segna, in a *Thesis Academica*, published at Rome in 1897, and entitled *De Successione priorum Romanorum Pontificum* (pp. 41, 42), candidly acknowledges that Eusebius must have used an inaccurate copy of S. Irenaeus' treatise, "cum Irenaei certa explorataque sententia sit Hyginum octavo loco censi debere."

² Dom Massuet, in a note on S. Iren., III. iv. 3, rightly says, "Romanos pontifices enumerat ab apostolis, quibus verbis Petrum a catalogo suo perspicue removet" (Migne's *Patrol. Graec.*, vii. 857).

³ Cf. S. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiv. *ad Pompeium*, § 2, *Opp.*, ii. 801, ed. Hartel.

⁴ Dom Massuet mentions that the true reading, "octavum," occurs in a MS. which was collated by Passeratius. Massuet concludes from various readings of this MS., which have been preserved, that it was "perantiquus ac bonae notae" (see Stieren's edition of S. Irenaeus, vol. i. p. xiii., and vol. ii. p. 48). Stieren agrees with Massuet in this estimate (*op. cit.*, vol. i. p. xiii.).

⁵ Cardinal Segna, in the *thesis* quoted above, admits (p. 63) that S. Irenaeus places S. Peter and S. Paul "extra numerum." He tries, of course, to get over the difficulty created by this fact, but, more prudent than some other writers of his communion, he does not dispute the fact.

⁶ For Tertullian's use of "*census*" in the sense of "origin," see Ochler's note on the *De Coronâ*, cap. xiii. (*Opp.* Tertull., i. 452).

that Polycarp was placed there by John, and the Church of Rome that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter. In exactly the same way, the other apostolic churches produce those whom, as having been appointed by the apostles to the episcopate, they regard as the transmitters of the apostolic seed."¹ According to Tertullian, each apostolic church traced back its succession to its first bishop, its "*primus episcopus*," who was himself appointed and ordained by his "predecessor" (*antecessor*), the apostolic "*auctor*," or founder. Thus the "*primus episcopus*" of Smyrna was S. Polycarp, who was ordained by S. John, the founder of the Church of Smyrna; and the "*primus episcopus*" of Rome was (so Tertullian implies) S. Clement, who was ordained by S. Peter, the founder of the Church of Rome. The apostolic founder was, of course, the *predecessor* of "the first bishop" in a large sense of the word "predecessor." No one supposes that S. John was ever, strictly speaking, the local Bishop of Smyrna, although Tertullian implies that he was S. Polycarp's predecessor. No doubt before S. Polycarp's consecration the Church of Smyrna, as well as other Asian churches, had been under S. John's apostolic care; and similarly the Church of Rome had, before the consecration of its first bishop, been under the joint supervision of S. Peter and S. Paul. But these two apostles had also the care of many other churches, which they had founded or organized. There is no reason to suppose that they were in a true sense diocesan Bishops of Rome, any more than that they were diocesan Bishops of Corinth. S. John ordinarily resided at Ephesus, but he was not the Bishop of Ephesus. The "angel" or bishop of the Church of Ephesus was an entirely different person, as is clear from the Apocalypse.² The sees of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, and the rest were not apostolic sees because S. John died in them, but because S. John founded them; and similarly the see of Rome was an apostolic see, not because S. Peter died in it, but because S. Peter and S. Paul founded it. This was evidently the view of Tertullian, who agreed with S. Irenaeus in teaching, or at least implying, that S. Peter was never Bishop of Rome. Bishop Lightfoot, who had, I suppose, studied the literature

¹ "Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successionem ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiae apostolicae census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Ioanne collocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum itidem. Perinde utique et ceterae exhibent quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant."—Tertull., *De Praescript. Haeret.*, cap. xxxii.

² See Rev. ii. 1; and see also Additional Note 12, p. 442.

of the early Church more minutely and accurately than any one before him, writes as follows: "I cannot find that any writers for the first two centuries and more speak of S. Peter as Bishop of Rome. Indeed, their language is inconsistent with the assignment of this position to him."¹ If it be true, as it certainly is true, that the language of the Christian writers of the first two centuries is inconsistent with the notion that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome, then it is morally certain that S. Peter was not Bishop of Rome; and, even if all the writers of later centuries asserted that he was, which, however, is very far from being the case, their evidence would have no weight, and might safely be neglected. It is not at all an uncommon thing to find earlier writers handing on the true account of some historical event, while later writers distort or altogether falsify the tradition. It is not necessary to impute mendacity to these later writers. They often record in perfect good faith the account, as they have received it. But the fact remains that, where the later witnesses differ from the earlier witnesses, there is normally an overwhelming probability that the earlier form of the tradition approximates most closely to the truth.

It is no part of my business to explain how the story of S. Peter's Roman episcopate was originated and spread. Various theories about its origination might be suggested. Dr. Bright has told us that for his part he thinks that the story "was likely enough to grow up anyhow, as the great name of Peter was more and more emphasized, and, as it were, isolated, in the thought of Roman ecclesiastics."² The fact that S. James was undoubtedly the first Bishop of Jerusalem might suggest the notion that at Rome also the first bishop was an apostle; and who could that be but the senior of the two apostolic founders? However, for my own part, I feel little doubt that it is to the Clementine romance that we must look for the true origin of the story. This romance was a heretical production, written by some unknown author in the interests of the Ebionitish sect. It has come down to our times in two principal forms: the one called *The Clementine Homilies*, the other *The Clementine Recognitions*.³ But there seems to have been a form older than either of these, which was known as *The Circuits of Peter*, and there may have been other earlier documents containing germs of the story. To one or more of these editions of the Romance was

¹ *S. Clement of Rome*, ii. 501.

² The *Guardian* for September 9, 1896, p. 1376; compare Dr. Bright's treatment of the matter in *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 13-15.

³ There are also still extant two shorter and probably later forms, commonly called *The Epitomes*.

prefixed a spurious epistle, purporting to have been addressed, after the death of S. Peter, by S. Clement to S. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and describing how S. Peter, before his death, consecrated S. Clement to be his successor as Bishop of Rome. In this spurious letter S. Peter is represented as speaking a good deal about his chair; but this chair is not the throne of government of the universal Church,¹ but "the chair of discourse,"² or, as we should say, the pulpit, in the local community at Rome. S. Peter is represented as saying, shortly before his death, to the assembly of Roman Christians, "Hear me, brethren and fellow-servants. Since . . . the day of my death is approaching, I lay hands on this Clement as your bishop; and to him I entrust my chair of discourse,"³ etc. Then Clement is represented as kneeling before S. Peter, and entreating him, "declining the honour and authority of the chair."⁴ However, S. Peter insists; and after giving a somewhat lengthy charge, he lays his hands on Clement, and compels him "to sit in his own chair."⁵

All this is, of course, pure romance. No one now dreams of attaching the smallest importance to the story as being in any way historically true; but in the third and fourth and following centuries, it was accepted as true. Even when the discourses and teaching attributed in the romance to S. Peter were perceived to be heretical, and were rejected, yet considerable portions of the framework of the story were supposed to give a true account of what had actually happened.

Now, it appears that one great object of the author of the romance was to depreciate S. Paul. S. Peter is represented as speaking of S. Paul as "the man who is my enemy," who leads the Gentiles to reject "my preaching of the law."⁶ S. Paul's labours among the heathen are ignored, and S. Peter is substituted for him as the apostle of the Gentiles. S. Peter, we are told, "as being fittest of all, was commanded to enlighten the darker part of the world, namely the West, and was enabled to accomplish it."⁷

¹ See the Additional Note 13, p. 443.

² Τὴν ἐμὴν τῶν λόγων καθέδραν.

³ See *The Epistle of Clement to James* (prefixed to *The Clementine Homilies*), cap. ii., Clem. Rom. *Homiliae*, ed. Dressel, p. 11.

⁴ Cf. cap. iii. p. 12.

⁵ Εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ καθέδραν. Cf. cap. xix. p. 23.

⁶ See *The Epistle of Peter to James*, prefixed to *The Clementine Homilies* (*Hom.*, ed. Dressel, p. 4). Compare also very specially *Hom.* xvii. 19 (*Op. cit.*, pp. 351, 352), where *κατεργασμένον* evidently refers to Gal. ii. 11: see also Dr. Salmon's article on *Clementine Literature*, in Smith and Wace, *D.C.B.*, i. 576, and Bishop Lightfoot's preface to his commentary on S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (ninth edit., pp. 61, 62); also his notes on Gal. ii. 11, 13, iv. 10, 16, 24, and in the same volume his excursus on *S. Paul and the Three* (pp. 327-330).

⁷ *Epistle of Clement to James*, cap. i. p. 10.

It naturally results from this anti-Pauline tendency that when S. Peter is represented as consecrating Clement to be his successor, he makes him "sit in *his own* chair." From the nature of the case, the author being an Ebionite, S. Paul's relation to the Church of Rome is passed over in silence. The episcopal chair at Rome is described as the chair of Peter. It is obvious that this spurious letter of Clement to James would, wherever it was received as authentic, tend to bring about that "isolation" of the great name of Peter in connexion with the see of Rome, to which Dr. Bright alludes in a passage which I have already quoted. The impression produced by the Clementine letter in regard to the apostolic foundation and organization of the Roman Church is very different from that which results from a consideration of the real historical facts. What really happened was that the Church of Rome was first brought into relation with S. Paul, who prepared the way for his apostolic visit by addressing to it the greatest of his Epistles; and afterwards spent at least two whole years in Rome, living in his own hired dwelling, receiving there all that went in unto him, and preaching to them the Kingdom of God; and later on, after the absence of unknown duration which followed his first acquittal, returned once more to Rome, and there took up again his work of preaching and organizing, and finally in Rome underwent his last trial and martyrdom.

There seems to be no good reason for supposing that S. Peter was ever at Rome until after his brother apostle's first acquittal.¹ Bishop Lightfoot thinks that S. Peter was only a few months in Rome, and that he was put to death during the Neronian persecution. If we accept Harnack's revised chronology, S. Peter's stay in Rome may have extended to the length of four or five years.² It seems highly probable that S. Paul returned to Rome the second time before S. Peter's martyrdom, for S. Irenaeus tells us that S. Matthew's Gospel was published "while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome,"³ and he also tells us that, "having founded and built up the Church, *they* committed the ministry of the episcopate to Linus."⁴ As we have seen, this consecration of Linus may have taken place some time

¹ Compare Bishop Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome*, ii. 497; and see Additional Note 14, p. 444.

² The chronology of the later portion of S. Paul's life depends very largely on the date which may be assigned for the commencement of the Judæan procuratorship of Porcius Festus. Formerly it was generally supposed that Festus arrived at Caesarea in the year 60. But of late some critics of great name have been led to think that the true date is 56. See Harnack's *Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, pp. 239, 718; and compare Mgr. Batiffol in the *Revue Biblique* for July, 1897, pp. 423, 424.

³ III. i. 1.

⁴ III. ii. 3.

before the death of the two apostles. Nor is it by any means certain that their deaths were contemporaneous. Many learned writers suppose that S. Peter's martyrdom preceded S. Paul's by at least one year. From all this it follows that S. Paul was equally with S. Peter a founder of the Roman Church; that, in fact, S. Paul was in close relations with the Roman Church before S. Peter came to the city; that S. Paul very possibly prolonged his residence in Rome some time after the death of his brother apostle; and that, before that event had taken place, the two apostles had joined in consecrating Linus to be the first Roman bishop. But according to the Clementine letter to James, Peter was the sole apostolic founder of the Roman Church, and the sole consecrator of his successor, Clement. Thus we may fairly say that authentic history puts S. Peter and S. Paul on a level in the matter of the foundation of the Roman Church, whereas the Clementine romance suppresses S. Paul and isolates S. Peter. Belief in the historical truth of the Clementine romance would tend to substitute the idea of the see of Peter in lieu of the older and truer idea, which would think of the episcopal chair at Rome as being the see founded by S. Peter and S. Paul. And when once men had become familiarized with the expression "the see of Peter," it would be very easy to conclude that, as S. James was the first bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, so S. Peter was not merely the founder, but also the first bishop of the Church of Rome.¹

Thus, if it could be shown that the Clementine romance had any influence in Rome between the time of S. Irenaeus and the close of the first quarter of the third century, we should be able to account very easily for the fact that, whereas the writers of the first two centuries knew nothing of S. Peter's Roman episcopate, some Western writers of the middle of the third century seem to imply that they believed that S. Peter was the first bishop of Rome.

Have we, then, any reason to suppose that the Clementine romance, in one or other of its various forms, did circulate among and influence the members of the Roman Church during the last two decades of the second century and during

¹ The process of transforming an apostolic founder into a local bishop would be facilitated by the fact that the apostolic churches were accustomed to draw up catalogues of their bishops, and it was usual for the list of names to be headed by the name of the apostolic founder (cf. Tertull., *de Praescript. Haeret.*, cap. xxxii., quoted on pp. 39, 40). This practice was originally adopted in order that it might clearly appear that "the first bishop" "had for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the apostles or of the apostolic men." But it is not difficult to see how easy it would be to assimilate the first name on the list with those that followed, so that in time the apostle would be accepted as the first bishop, and he who was formerly venerated as the first bishop would come to be regarded as the second, and so on.

the first twenty-five years of the century which followed? I think that cogent reasons for such a supposition are not far to seek, and I will do what I can to set them forth.

It will, I think, be admitted on all hands that according to the original tradition of the Roman Church the sequence of the names of its earliest bishops ran as follows: (1) Linus, (2) Anencletus (*alias* Cletus), (3) Clement. Some would, of course, head the whole list with the name of S. Peter, but for the purposes of my present argument I am considering only the names of those who came after the apostles. The sequence of names, as I have given it above, is found in the Roman Canon of the Mass. It is found also in S. Irenaeus;¹ and finally it is found in S. Epiphanius,² and Bishop Lightfoot has given very strong reasons³ for believing that S. Epiphanius' list is based on a list compiled by Hegesippus, a writer who is slightly anterior to Irenaeus. As both Hegesippus and Irenaeus spent some time in Rome, they are very good witnesses in regard to the tradition of the Church of Rome.

But soon after the time of Hegesippus and S. Irenaeus a new view seems to have become more or less popular among the Christians at Rome. Tertullian, in a passage which I have already quoted,⁴ and which was written about the year 200, is describing how the apostolic churches, when they give an account of their beginnings, are accustomed to show by the catalogue of their bishops "that their much-venerated first bishop had for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the apostles or of the apostolic men." Tertullian goes on to give examples of this practice, and he says, "As, for instance, the Church of Smyrna relates that Polycarp was placed there by John, and the Church of Rome that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter." It appears, therefore, that during the years immediately preceding the year 200 an alteration had taken place in the ideas of the members of the Roman Church or of some of them. Linus was no longer regarded as "the first bishop," but that honourable position was assigned to Clement, whose true place on the list was the third, and not the first. There can be no doubt that the Linus tradition is right, and that the Clement tradition is wrong.⁵

But the question remains to be answered, How was the change of belief at Rome between 180 and 200 brought about?

¹ III. ii. 3.

² *Hacr.*, xxvii. 6.

³ *S. Clement of Rome*, i. 327-333. It may be worth noting that Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Church*, pp. 21, 22) expresses the opinion that Bishop Lightfoot has established his case in regard to this point.

⁴ See pp. 39, 40.

⁵ Yet we learn from S. Jerome that in his time "plerique Latinorum" supposed that S. Clement was the immediate successor of S. Peter (cf. *De Viris Illustribus*, cap. xv., *P. L.*, xxiii. 631). The *De Viris* was written in 392.

Bishop Lightfoot¹ and Dr. Salmon reply that the change was probably brought about through the influence of the Clementine romance. It is noteworthy that the Ultramontane Dr. Jungmann, professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Louvain, suggests the same explanation.² It is surely more likely that the author of the Clementine romance, who had selected S. Clement to be the hero of his story, and who makes him out to have been S. Peter's companion in his missionary journeys, should have devised the fable of his being S. Peter's immediate successor, rather than that that story should have been concocted at Rome, where an earlier and truer account had been handed down in the church from the beginning. The choice appears to lie between Rome and the Clementines as the origin of the fable, for we find no trace of it elsewhere until long afterwards. Under these circumstances, I think that most persons of discrimination will come to the conclusion that this legend, which had such far-reaching effects, was invented by the Ebionite author of the spurious letter of Clement to James, or by some earlier romancer belonging to the same school. There seems to have been a copious Ebionite literature in the second century, and the writers appear to have had a predilection for fictitious accounts of the doings of the apostles. Bishop Lightfoot speaks of "a vast number of works which, though no longer extant, have yet moulded the traditions of the early Church," and which "emanated from these Christian Essenes:" "Hence, doubtless, are derived the ascetic portraits of James the Lord's brother in Hegesippus, and of Matthew the apostle in Clement of Alexandria, to which the account of S. Peter in the extant Clementines presents a close parallel."³

If it be admitted that the story of S. Clement being S. Peter's immediate successor is more likely to have originated in one of the earlier forms of the Clementine romance than among the Catholics of Rome, then in all probability that form of the romance preceded Tertullian's *De Praescriptione* by at least fifteen or twenty years. Though the story is

¹ See Additional Note 15, p. 444.

² Jungmann says, "Animadvertendum venit hoc loco, aliquos antiquos auctores, ut Tertullianum, existimasse, Petri primum successorem fuisse Clementem. . . . Ratio autem ob quam aliqui post Petrum numerarunt Clementem, haec forte fuit, quod Clemens ipse in Epistola ad Jacobum dicat, se fuisse a Petro consecratum episcopum, quod etiam Tertullianus affirmat *De Praescript.*, c. 32." (*Dissertationes Selectae in Hist. Eccl.*, tom. i. p. 121, ed. 1880.) Jungmann is not the only learned Ultramontane who attributes the tendency to bring S. Clement into close connexion with S. Peter to the effect of the Clementine literature. On this point see the Additional Note 16, p. 444.

³ *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, ed. 1892, p. 80. Bishop Lightfoot conjectures (*Op. cit.*, p. 126) that Hegesippus derived his account of S. James' martyrdom from the Ebionite *Ascents of James*.

not likely to have originated at Rome, yet, when once it had begun to circulate, we can readily see that it would be likely to affect opinion at Rome. A detailed account of the consecration of one of the best-known Roman bishops by the chief of the apostles would be exceedingly interesting and pleasing to the local Church of Rome, or, at any rate, to many of its members. Thus the letter of Clement to James, or some earlier form of the story, would be very welcome in Roman Christian circles; and when once that letter or story had been accepted, the isolation of S. Peter as the one "*auctor*" of the Roman Church and the one consecrator of its first bishop would, as I have already pointed out, be sure to follow. In this way the name of S. Peter would appear by itself at the head of the list of names on the catalogue of the Roman bishops, and in a little while he would come to be regarded as having been himself the earliest bishop of the Roman Church. The first stage of the process had been reached at the time when Tertullian wrote the *De Praescriptione*.¹ We have no proof that the second stage was reached until from thirty to forty years later.

Dr. Rivington has made an attempt to disprove the Ebionite origin of the belief in S. Peter's Roman Episcopate by making much of the fact that that belief was accepted by Eusebius and by S. Epiphanius,² who in all probability obtained some of their information about the early Roman bishops from Hegesippus. But it must be remembered that Eusebius and S. Epiphanius lived in the fourth century—that is to say, in an age when the belief that S. Peter had been Bishop of Rome was widely spread. There is no sort of reason for supposing that those writers were indebted to Hegesippus for this particular detail of their teaching. Again, Dr. Rivington raises another objection to the thesis which I am defending, when he expresses his opinion that the Ebionite character of the Clementine documents would prevent their having any influence at Rome. He says, "Was the glorification of S. Clement sufficient to balance the depreciation of S. Peter in the same narrative below S. James? And could Rome ever bear any approach to an Ebionitish view of the apostle of the Gentiles?"³

¹ The author of *The Little Labyrinth*, a treatise directed against the heresy of Artemon, seems, like Tertullian, to have isolated S. Peter, and to have regarded him as the founder rather than the first bishop of the see of Rome. In a passage of this treatise, quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.*, v. 28), the author speaks of "Victor, who was the thirteenth Bishop of Rome from Peter." Dr. Salmon (Smith and Wace, *D.C.B.*, iii. 98) ascribes this treatise against Artemon to Caius, and seems to show that it certainly was not written by S. Hippolytus. The treatise was, anyhow, written by a person intimately acquainted with the contemporary affairs of the Roman Church, and the date of writing must have been about the year 230.

² *Prim. Church*, p. 22.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

To the latter question it may be answered that any document in which S. Paul was openly attacked by name would almost certainly have been rejected as heretical by any primitive Catholic church, whether at Rome or elsewhere. But such open attacks are not found in the Clementine literature. In these documents S. Paul is sometimes covertly denounced in the person of Simon Magus; sometimes he is described as "the enemy"; sometimes he is passed over in silence on occasions when he would undoubtedly have been mentioned if the writer had not been an Ebionite. Our practised eyes can detect the heretical *animus* of writings which were accepted as orthodox by the less critical Christians of the early centuries. As a matter of fact, the Clementine literature circulated very largely among the Catholics of Rome and Italy. S. Paulinus of Nola is supposed by some to have made an ineffectual attempt to translate the Clementine Recognitions. They were actually translated by Rufinus, who had been urged to undertake the task by S. Silvia of Aquitaine, and after her death by S. Gaudentius of Brescia. Mgr. Duchesne says, "Le roman Syrien eut au IV^e et au V^e siècle, une très grande vogue dans les cercles orthodoxes."¹ The letter to James was quoted as genuine by the Council of Vaison² in 442. It is also quoted more than once in the *Liber Pontificalis*,³ an eminently Roman book. That same letter, augmented by additional spurious matter, finds a place in the forefront of the celebrated forged decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore;⁴ and it is quoted as an authority by Pope Gregory VII.⁵ in a letter to Herimann of Metz. Altogether, this objection raised by Dr. Rivington will not hold good. The Church of Rome and other Western churches failed during many centuries to detect the Ebionite tendency of these writings.

As we have seen, the Clementine story was continually being republished in ever-varying forms. We still possess four of these forms; and there was at least one other form, earlier than any of these, which has not come down to us. The progress of discovery and criticism may enable us hereafter to settle with precision the dates of the various documents.⁶

¹ *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 98.

² Canon vi. (Coleti, iv. 717, 718).

³ *Lib. Pont.*, ed. Duchesne, i. 123.

⁴ *Decretales Pseudo-Isidor.*, ed. Hinsch., pp. 30-46.

⁵ Greg. VII., *Registr.*, lib. iv. ep. ii., *P.L.*, cxlviii. 454.

⁶ Harnack apparently holds that the whole of the Pseudo-Clementine literature belongs to the third century. The reason which he gives for this determination is not convincing, and will hardly commend itself either to Anglicans or to Romanists. Harnack says (*Outlines of the History of Dogma*, p. 79, English translation), "The polemic and the means made use of [in the Clementines] prove that the Catholic Church was already in existence. Therefore the Pseudo-

At present we cannot say for certain that the letter to James is earlier than the *De Praescriptione* of Tertullian, though probably it is so. Bishop Lightfoot (*S. Clement of Rome*, i. 414) says, "Its date can hardly be earlier than the middle of the second century, or much later than the beginning of the third." If we accept the latest possible date for the letter, then it was an earlier form of the story which circulated in Rome between 180 and 200.

Before taking leave of this subject, it may be worth while to recall once more to the reader's mind the fact that my argument against the soundness of the theory that S. Peter was at one time Bishop of Rome does not depend in any way on what I have written about the Clementine romance; it depends on the fact that the language of the writers of the first two centuries is inconsistent with the assignment of the Roman Episcopate to the great apostle. I myself believe that the Clementine romance had a great deal to do with that change of view at Rome which resulted in the adoption of the theory of S. Peter having been the first Roman bishop; but whether the romance had or had not the effect which I attribute to it, in any case the view of the Roman Church was changed, and the later theory cannot claim the weight which would attach to an original tradition of that church.

S. Cyprian's Witness.

I now invite your attention to the history of S. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and I hope to make clear to you how, from beginning to end, his whole action is absolutely inconsistent with the teaching about the papacy set forth in the Vatican decrees.

I have already pointed out the way in which S. Cyprian

Clementine writings belong to the third century." Orthodox Christians hold that the Catholic Church came into existence on the day of Pentecost; and it is not easy to understand how even Harnack could deny that it existed in the time of S. Irenaeus. Harnack, however, adds that "it is probable that the compilers had before them earlier anti-Pauline writings." Thus even according to Harnack's hypothesis, the germ of the Clementines would seem to date from the second century. Mgr. Batiffol follows Harnack closely, and comes to much the same conclusion. Speaking of the Clementine *Recognitions* and *Homilies*, he says (*Anciennes Littératures Chrésiennes—Littérature Grecque*, pp. 48, 49, ed. 1897), "A prendre les deux textes ensemble et dans leur forme actuelle, ils représentent une production de la première moitié du iii^e siècle (Lagarde, Harnack, Zahn). Ils doivent leur forme actuelle à des catholiques, qui n'y ont vu qu'une matière à s'édifier et un roman didactique pouvant servir à la refutation du paganisme (Harnack). . . . *Les thèmes fondamentaux (monarchie de Dieu, prophétie, stoïcisme) fait penser que la source de cette littérature doit être cherchée dans le syncrétisme judéo-chrétien du ii^e siècle.*" (The italics are mine.) Compare the Additional Note 16, p. 444.

corresponds with the various popes with whom he was contemporary, on terms of complete equality. He speaks of them and addresses them as his brothers and his colleagues. And it must not be supposed that this familiar style of address was due to the primitive simplicity of the Christians of that age. On the contrary, when the priests and deacons of Rome have occasion to write to S. Cyprian, they conclude their letter thus: "Most blessed and most glorious Pope, we bid you ever heartily farewell in the Lord."¹ And again, when the same priests and deacons of Rome, writing to the clergy of Carthage, have occasion to refer to S. Cyprian, they say, "We have learnt . . . that the blessed Pope Cyprian has, for a certain reason, retired."² It is clear, therefore, that, whatever may have been the simplicity of Christians in the third century, it did not preclude the use of respectful titles in letters to persons in authority; and we may safely draw the conclusion that when S. Cyprian, writing to the Roman bishop, calls him his dear brother and colleague, he so writes because he naturally thinks of the Roman pope as an equal; whereas the priests and deacons of Rome, the body of officials which is now known as the College of cardinals, realized that S. Cyprian, as a bishop and primate, was exceedingly superior to themselves in rank, and that it was their duty to address him with words of reverential respect, such as "most blessed Pope," "most glorious Pope," and the like.

The episode in S. Cyprian's life which throws most light on his view of the relation of the Roman see to the rest of the Church, is undoubtedly his controversy with Pope Stephen about the validity of heretical baptism. But it will be well to refer first of all to some other incidents in his career, which took place at an earlier stage, and were unconnected with the heat of controversy, so that we may be in a position to judge whether his action in regard to Stephen was a new departure, or whether it was not rather the carrying out of his normal principles.

We will take first a passage from one of his letters to Pope Cornelius, part of which is usually quoted by Roman Catholics as decidedly in their favour. Their view proceeds from a misconception as to the meaning of certain words which S. Cyprian uses. The passage, taken as a whole, is irreconcilable with the papal system. S. Cyprian is writing to the pope to warn him against a ringleader of schism named Fortunatus, who had been consecrated to be an opposition

¹ "Beatissime et gloriosissime Papa." *Ep. cler. Romani ad Cyprianum, inter Cyprianicas xxx. § 8, Opp.*, ii. 556.

² "Benedictum Papam Cyprianum." *Ep. cler. Rom. ad cler. Carthag., inter Cyprianicas viii., Opp.*, ii. 485.

Bishop of Carthage by an excommunicated heretic bishop named Privatus. The party, which had started this schism, had already been condemned by a large council of Catholic bishops held at Carthage under S. Cyprian's presidency. But now, having secured the consecration of one of their leaders, they sent legates to Rome to try and induce Cornelius to recognize them as the true Church of North Africa. A short time before, a similar schism had broken out in Rome. Cornelius had been consecrated pope, and the schismatics had consecrated Novatian to be opposition pope; and both pope and anti-pope had sent legates to Carthage to induce Cyprian to declare himself on their side, and to grant them his communion. Now the parts were reversed, and Carthage was the scene of the schism. As soon as Cyprian heard that the schismatics of Carthage had sent legates to Rome, he wrote to Cornelius, his "dearest brother," to put him on his guard. He says, "Having had a pseudo-bishop ordained for them by heretics, they dare to set sail, and to carry letters from schismatic and profane persons to the chair of Peter, *adque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*"¹ I need say nothing about the expression, "chair of Peter," as applied to the see of Rome. By the time of S. Cyprian, Western Christians, influenced directly or indirectly by the Clementine romance, had learnt to apply the title to the Roman see. But what does S. Cyprian exactly mean, when he describes the Roman Church as the "*ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*"? I have no doubt that he means that the Roman Church is the mother-church of Italy and Africa, whence the whole episcopate of those countries is derived. The word "principalis" is used by African writers in the sense of *ancient* or *primaeval*. So Tertullian, wishing to state that truth comes *first* and falsehood afterwards, contrasts the "*principalitas veritatis*" with the "*posteritas mendacitatis*;"² in other words, the "*antiquity* of truth" with the "*lateness* of falsehood."³ The "*ecclesia principalis*" is the *primaeval* church, the *mother-church*; in the words of S. Irenaeus, "that very ancient church, founded at Rome."⁴ Not, of course, that S. Cyprian thought that the Church of Rome was the mother-church of the world. Obviously that would

¹ "And to the mother-church [of the West], whence the united body of [Western] bishops sprang." *Ep.* lix. *ad Cornelium*, § 14, *Opp.*, ii. 683.

² Tert. *De Praeser.*, xxxi. Cf. Tert. *adv. Valent.*, cap. v.

³ Compare S. Augustine's use of the word *principale* in a passage quoted on p. 102, and see the ancient Latin translation of S. Irenaeus, *Contra omnes Haereticos*, IV. xxvi. 2; V. xiv. 1, 2; V. xxi. 1. Du Cange, in his *Glossarium*, s.v. "Principalis," interprets the word to mean, "Primus, primaevus, antiquior" (tom. v. p. 447, edit. 1845).

⁴ *Contra omnes Haereticos*, III. iii. 2.

not be true. The Church of Jerusalem is necessarily the mother-church of the whole world. To use the words of S. Irenaeus,¹ the Church of Jerusalem is "that church from which every church had its origin:" it is "the metropolis, the mother-city of the citizens of the new covenant." But, though the Church of Rome is not the mother-church of the world, yet it is the mother-church of Italy and of Africa and of the greater part of the West. The original bishops who evangelized Africa were no doubt consecrated at Rome.² The episcopate of Italy and Africa issued out from Rome. S. Cyprian often calls the united episcopate, either of the whole Church or of some notable part of it, by such terms as these, "collegium sacerdotale," "collegium sacerdotum;" here he uses the expression, "unitas sacerdotalis."³ He means by all these expressions *the episcopal body*, considered as forming a *unity*. Some Roman Catholic writers have supposed that S. Cyprian is intending to teach that the Roman see is the perennial fountain of unity. But the Latin will not bear that interpretation. S. Cyprian does not say, "unde unitas sacerdotalis exoritur," but "unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est." He is referring to a historical event which took place long before, namely, the original derivation of the true canonical episcopate of North Africa from the mother-church of the West.⁴

But to return to S. Cyprian's letter to Cornelius. After referring to S. Paul's commendation (in his Epistle to the

¹ III. xii. 5.

² Cf. S. Greg. Magn., *Registr. Epistt.* lib. viii. ep. xxxiii. ad *Dominicum*, P.L., lxxvii. 935.

³ Cf. *Ep. lv. ad Antonianum*, *Opp.*, ii. 624 *sq.* Compare Hincmar (*De divortio Hl. et Theut.*), quoted by Milman (*Latin Christianity*, ii. 292, note, 2nd edit., 1857): "Nostrâ aetate Hludovicum Augustum a regno dejectum, post satisfactionem, *episcopalis unanimitas*, saniore concilio, cum populi consensu, et ecclesiae et regno restituit." Compare also the letter of the bishops of (Northern) Italy to the bishops of Illyricum, preserved in the 12th *Hilarian Fragment* (P.L., x. 717); they say, "Quicumque igitur *nostrae unanimitatis* optat habere consortium. . . quae sunt nostrae sententiae comprobare festinet." I am not aware that the genuineness of this letter has been questioned; but, whether genuine or not, it illustrates S. Cyprian's expression, "*unitas sacerdotalis*." A still better illustration may perhaps be found in S. Augustine's statement about the promise of the keys to S. Peter. In his 295th Sermon (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1683, v. 1194) he says, "Has enim claves non homo unus, sed *unitas* accepit *Ecclesiae*." Here "*unitas Ecclesiae*" evidently means, not the unity of the Church in the abstract, but the united society or body of the Church. It was the society which received the keys, not an attribute of the society. Similarly, S. Cyprian's "*unitas sacerdotalis*" means the united body of the bishops.

⁴ Mr. Gore (*The Church and the Ministry*, 1st edit. p. 169, n.), speaking of the words "unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est," says, "These last words mean, I suppose, simply that Peter's priesthood was the first given." Such an interpretation harmonizes thoroughly with S. Cyprian's general teaching, but I feel a difficulty about referring the word "unde" to "Petri;" it seems more natural to refer it to the whole phrase, "Petri cathedram atque . . . ecclesiam principalem." See also Additional Note 17, p. 445.

Romans)¹ of the faith of the Roman Christians, he goes on, "But what is the occasion of the schismatics going to you, and of their announcing that a pseudo-bishop has been set up against the true bishops? for either they are well pleased with what they have done, and persevere in their wickedness; or, if it displeases them and they desist [from their schism], they know whither they should return."² He meant to say, "What is the good of their going to Rome? If they want to be restored to the unity of the Church, they ought to know that they must come to me and my colleagues here in Africa." He shows that this is his meaning by the words which follow. He says, "For since it has been decreed by our whole body, and is alike equitable and just, that every cause should be there heard where the offence has been committed; and a portion of the flock has been assigned to the several shepherds, which each is to rule and govern, having hereafter to give account of his administration to the Lord; it therefore behoves those over whom we are set, not to run about from place to place, nor, by their crafty and deceitful boldness, break the harmonious concord of the bishops, but there to plead their cause, where they will have both accusers and witnesses of their crime; *unless perhaps some few desperate and abandoned men count as inferior the authority of the bishops established in Africa*, who have already given judgement concerning them, and have lately, by the weight of their decision, condemned those persons' consciences, entangled in the bonds of many sins. Already has their cause been heard; already has sentence been given concerning them." In this passage S. Cyprian says that African Christians have no right "to run about from place to place," and appeal from the judgement of the African bishops to the Roman pope. He thus flatly contradicts the decree of the Vatican Council, which declares that "in all causes which appertain to the jurisdiction of the Church," "recourse may be had to the judgement of the Roman pontiff;" and we must observe that the council bases this declaration on the fact that the pope "presides over the universal Church" "by the *divine right* of the apostolic primacy."³ If the theory about the papacy set forth by the Vatican Council is right, S. Cyprian was guilty of repudiating one of the prerogatives of "the true vicar of Christ," which flows immediately from his divinely given primacy of jurisdiction. Nay, S. Cyprian goes further; he implies that no Christians are likely to consider the Roman pope to have a better right than the African bishops to deal finally with the case of these African schismatics, except "some few desperate

¹ Rom. i. 8.

² *Ep.* lix. *ad Cornelium*, § 14, *Opp.*, ii. 683.

³ See p. 4.

and abandoned men.”¹ It is for Ultramontanes, who profess to venerate S. Cyprian and the early Church, to consider whether they are prepared to accept his teaching on this point; and if not, why not. From the Ultramontane point of view, S. Cyprian is dealing with no minor matter, but with the fundamental question of the relation of the divinely appointed head of the Church to the subordinate members. And then consider, To whom did S. Cyprian write these clear statements of truth? He wrote them to S. Cornelius, the pope; and he begs the pope to read this letter of his to the clergy and people of the local Church of Rome. He says, “Though I am aware, dearest brother, that by reason of the mutual love which we owe and manifest towards each other, you always read my epistles to the very eminent clergy who there preside with you, and to your most holy and flourishing people; yet now I both exhort and beg of you, to do at my request, what on other occasions you do of your own accord and of courtesy, and read this my epistle.”² Evidently S. Cyprian knew perfectly well that there was nothing in his letter which would give pain to S. Cornelius. The Catholic teaching concerning the true method of the Church’s government was held at Rome in those days, no less clearly than at Carthage.³ The whole Church would have agreed in

¹ See Additional Note 18, p. 446. The principle laid down by S. Cyprian in the passage discussed in the text was still in full force in the African Church 175 years later, in the time of S. Aurelius and S. Augustine. Compare the letter of the Council of Carthage to Pope Celestine, quoted on p. 192.

² *Ep. cil.*, § 19, *Opp.*, ii. 689. If S. Cyprian had thought that he was bound to the authority of the pope “by the obligation of true obedience,” why does he speak *only* of “the mutual love which we owe and manifest towards each other”? It would seem more natural for a fallible subordinate, writing to his infallible superior, to allude in some way to the great condescension shown by that superior in making a practice of reading publicly the subordinate’s letters in the assemblies of his local church. S. Cyprian’s words are perfectly appropriate, if he was writing to an equal; they seem very inappropriate, if he was writing to the vicar of Christ, the monarch of the militant Church.

³ An incidental proof of the fact that the Cyprianic principles of Church government were held at Rome in that age, is supplied by a letter addressed by the Roman clergy to S. Cyprian during a vacancy of the Roman see. S. Cyprian had written to them, giving an account of his resolutions about the treatment of the lapsed. In their reply they say, “To Pope Cyprian, the priests and deacons abiding at Rome send greeting. Although a mind conscious to itself of uprightness, and relying on the vigour of evangelical discipline, and made a true witness to itself in regard to [its fulfilment of] the divine commandments, is accustomed to be satisfied with God as its only Judge, and neither seeks the praises nor fears the charges of any other; yet they are worthy of double praise, who, *knowing that their conscience is subject to God as its only Judge*, do yet desire that their acts should have their brethren’s approval” (*Ep. cleri Romani ad Cyprianum, inter Cyprianicas xxx.* § 1, *Opp.*, ii. 549). If the Archbishop of Paris were to write to the authorities at Rome in the present day during a vacancy in the papal see, reporting the arrangements made by him in regard to an important question of discipline, they would hardly return the answer which their predecessors in the third century returned to S. Cyprian. There would probably be some reference to the fact that a pope would soon be elected, who would be able to ratify what the

repudiating the false theories set forth by the Vatican Council.

I am not professing to write an exhaustive monograph on S. Cyprian's teaching about the government of the Church; and it is impossible for me, within the limits assigned to me, to attempt to deal with the various misrepresentations of his sentiments which have been from time to time devised by Roman Catholic controversialists.¹ A careful consideration of the context, or of parallel passages in other writings of his, will generally suffice to make his meaning clear. Any one who wishes to go more fully into the subject will find much to help him in Archbishop Laud's *Conference with Fisher*, and also in a review of *Wilberforce on the Supremacy*, which appeared in the *Christian Remembrancer* for April, 1855.

I proceed to give an account of an incident in S. Cyprian's life, which has been represented as bearing witness to the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman see.² The facts of the case are these: Marcianus, Bishop of Arles, had joined himself to the Novatian schism, but still retained his position as chief pastor of the Church in Arles. Thereupon, the bishops of Gaul, and amongst them Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, wrote to Pope Stephen, the second successor of S. Cornelius, asking him, apparently, to give them advice and guidance in their difficulty. The question naturally arises—Why did the Gallican bishops apply for advice to Rome? In order to answer this question it will be necessary to set forth a few facts concerning the state of the Church in Gaul at that time. Mgr. Duchesne³ has given strong reasons for believing that until towards the middle of the third century there was only one bishop in Celtic Gaul, having his see at Lyons. But it would seem that shortly before the year 250 several churches were founded in Gaul by missionaries who came from Rome. S. Gregory of Tours⁴ speaks of seven missionary bishops sent from Rome in the middle of the third century. Tillemont (iv. 132) has argued that this mission took place during the reign of the Emperor Philip⁵ (A.D. 244-249). It would

archbishop had done; and there would assuredly be no stress laid on the principle that the judgement of the archbishop is subject to God only, nor surprise expressed at his having reported to Rome the determinations at which he had arrived.

¹ In Appendix B, with its *Addendum* (pp. 77-95), I have dealt with those Cyprianic passages which have been twisted into a Roman sense.

² Our knowledge of this incident is entirely derived from S. Cyprian's *Ep.* lxxviii. *ad Stephanum*, *Opp.*, ii. 744-749.

³ Duchesne, *Fastes Episcopaux de l'Ancienne Gaule*, tome i. pp. 30, 31, 32, 38-42, 59, 74, 101.

⁴ S. Greg. Turon., *Historia Francorum*, lib. i. cap. 28; compare Duchesne, *Fastes*, tome i. pp. 47, 48.

⁵ See Additional Note 19, p. 450.

thus appear that in the time of S. Cyprian the churches of Gaul, with the exception of the Church of Lyons (and perhaps that of Marseilles), were struggling infant missions planted in a heathen country. It appears also that there were no metropolitans in Gaul¹ until the end of the fourth century; so that these scattered missions, having no hierarchical organization of their own, would naturally look for help in difficulties to Rome, as being the mother-church, which had sent forth their missionary bishops. Doubtless if Gaul had been evangelized from Egypt, the bishops of Gaul would, under similar circumstances, have applied for help and counsel to the Bishop of Alexandria.² Or if it had been evangelized from Syria, they would have gone to the Bishop of Antioch. It would seem as if Stephen had been somewhat remiss in giving the advice for which he had been asked. The Bishop of Lyons, therefore, wrote more than one letter to S. Cyprian at Carthage, who was the second great metropolitan in the Latin-speaking portion of the Church; and S. Cyprian came to the conclusion that he would write to Stephen to urge him to help the afflicted Church of Gaul. No doubt S. Cyprian held that he had a perfect right to help that Church himself. But as he was living far away, and had no special connexion with the bishops in Gaul, and had only heard from Faustinus, whereas Stephen was near at hand, and was bishop of the church from which the missionary bishops in Gaul had been sent forth, and had had an application from *all* the Gallican bishops, it was more fitting that the answer should come from Stephen. In his letter to Stephen, S. Cyprian begins by laying down the principle that it is the duty of the bishops generally to give their help in such a case: "It is *ours*, dearest brother, to look to this affair and to remedy it. . . . Wherefore it behoves you to write a very full letter to our fellow-bishops established in Gaul, that they no longer suffer the froward and proud Marcianus . . . to insult over our college (*i.e.* the Catholic episcopate), because he seemeth as yet not to be excommunicated by us, who this long while boasts and publishes that . . . he has separated himself from our communion. . . . How idle were it, dearest brother, when Novatian has been lately repulsed and cast back and excommunicated by the priests of God throughout the world, were we now to suffer his flatterers still to mock us, and to judge respecting the majesty and dignity of the Church! Let letters be addressed from thee to the Province [*i.e.* the region of Gaul in which Arles is situated], and to the people dwelling at Arles, such letters as

¹ See Additional Note 20, p. 450.

² See note on p. 8.

that, in consequence of them, when Marcianus shall have been excommunicated [by the bishops of Gaul], another may be substituted in his room, and the flock of Christ, . . . be gathered together."¹ Thus S. Cyprian presses on Stephen the duty of writing a letter of counsel and help to those who had begged to be advised and helped. It was not the case of a new heresy or schism arising; that could hardly have been settled without a council of bishops. Nor was it a case in which the facts were doubtful. Marcianus himself boasted that he had separated himself from the Catholic communion. All that was needed was that the bishops of Gaul should be encouraged to do their duty and excommunicate their erring brother, and that then a new bishop should be elected, and consecrated, and be peaceably accepted by the church people of Arles. But again I must point out that, while S. Cyprian thought that, under the circumstances, Stephen was the appropriate person to convey the counsel of the Church at large to the Gallican brethren, he takes good care to make it clear that essentially the duty was one which might have been discharged by any other bishop, whose advice might have been asked. He does not write to Stephen in the style of the Vatican decrees. He does not say, "You have the 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church,' and this your 'power is ordinary and immediate over all and each of the churches, and over all and each of the pastors and of the faithful;'"² but he says, "For therefore, dearest brother, is the body of bishops so large, united together by the glue of mutual concord and the bond of unity, that if any of our college should attempt to introduce heresy . . . the rest may come in aid, and as good and merciful shepherds gather the Lord's sheep into the fold. . . . For what greater or better office have bishops, than by diligent solicitude and wholesome remedies to provide for cherishing and preserving the sheep? . . . For although we are many shepherds, yet we feed one flock, and ought to gather together and cherish all the sheep which Christ has acquired by His own Blood and Passion. . . . Signify plainly to us who has been substituted at Arles in the room of Marcianus, that we may know to whom we should direct our brethren, and to whom write. I bid you, dearest brother, ever heartily farewell."³ It seems almost incredible that any one should have discovered in this letter of S. Cyprian an argument for the modern Roman claims. Every sentence in it, almost, is a

¹ *Ep. cit.* §§ 2, 3, *Opp.*, ii. 745. On the construction of the sentence see the Additional Note 21, p. 450.

² *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

³ *Ep. cit.* §§ 3-5, *Opp.*, ii. 746-749.

contradiction of the papal theory.¹ The pope is urged, no doubt, to write and give his advice ; but it is carefully pressed upon him, that he is to write as one of the college of bishops, to all of whom it belongs to provide for the cherishing and preserving of the sheep. *He* is to write, because application has been specially made to *him*. If the application had been made to S. Cyprian by the bishops of Gaul, undoubtedly he would have felt that he was fully entitled to do all that was necessary. About the same time he did receive a similar application from some of the churches in Spain, and he wrote very vigorously to them, bidding them abide by the action of the bishops of their province, and pay no attention to a mistaken *dictum* of Pope Stephen. But in the present instance the application of the Gallican episcopate had been made to Stephen, and therefore S. Cyprian had no *locus standi* for directly interfering.

Rather more than a hundred years afterwards, in A.D. 390, we find the bishops of Gaul again in need of external help and counsel. They were still without the full metropolitan system. But by that time Milan had become the metropolitan see of North Italy, and Milan was nearer to Gaul than Rome. The Gallican bishops, therefore, applied for advice and help to S. Ambrose of Milan, as well as to Siricius of Rome ; and they got what they needed from the two great prelates to whom they wrote. The trouble which was then disturbing them was very similar to the trouble about Marcianus. It had to do with the schism of the Ithacians. Eight years later the Ithacian question came again to the front, and the Gallican bishops applied this time to S. Simplicianus, the immediate successor of S. Ambrose, and to him only. The council of the bishops of the province of Milan was held at Turin,² and in its sixth canon it decreed as follows : " If any should wish to separate themselves from the communion of Felix [the friend of the Ithacians], they shall be received into the fellowship of our peace, in accordance with the former letters of Ambrose of blessed memory, and of the bishop of the Roman Church."³ Here we notice that Milan is put first, and Rome second. Doubtless this order would have been unusual outside the province of Milan ; but in that province it was the natural order to use, so long as the Catholic system of Church government prevailed. The bishops of Milan and Rome were brother-metropolitans, and the Milanese prelate was more to the bishops of the

¹ See Additional Note 22, p. 451.

² The Jesuit, Padre Savio, has proved (*Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia—Il Piemonte*, 1899, pp. 564-566) that the Council of Turin was held in the year 398. It was undoubtedly a provincial council of the province of Milan.

³ *Concilia*, ii. 1383, ed. Coleti.

Milanese province than the Bishop of Rome was. They therefore naturally gave him precedence in their own province. Of course, if the Fathers of the council had supposed that the Bishop of Rome was the infallible vicar of Christ, having immediate episcopal jurisdiction in Milan, Turin, and everywhere else, they would certainly have given a different turn to the wording of their canon. But those dreams had not then been invented. Let us now return to S. Cyprian.

We have a letter written by him in the name of a council of African bishops to certain churches in Spain, which needed comfort and help.¹ Two Spanish bishops, Basilides and Martialis, had in the course of the Decian persecution become what was technically called "libellatics;" in other words, they had made an unworthy and sinful compromise with idolatry. S. Cyprian tells us that in the public proceedings before the ducenary procurator Martialis had appeared, and had put in a declaration that he had denied Christ and had conformed to idolatrous worship. Basilides must have made some compromise of a similar kind, for they had both "been contaminated with the profane *libellus* of idolatry." Martialis had also joined himself to one of the heathen *collegia* or guilds, and had in connection with this guild frequented for a long while "the foul and filthy feasts of the Gentiles;" while Basilides, when lying sick, had blasphemed against God; and there were many other heinous sins in which both had become implicated. Basilides, pricked by his conscience, had confessed his blasphemy, and had voluntarily laid down his bishopric, and had betaken himself to do penance, accounting himself most happy if he might hope to be admitted some day to lay communion. It appears that Basilides' resignation was accepted by the bishops of the province, and that Martialis was by them deposed and excommunicated; and the vacant sees were soon filled by the consecration of Sabinus as successor to Basilides, and of Felix as successor to Martialis. Afterwards Basilides went to Rome and deceived Pope Stephen, who was ignorant of the true state of the case, and admitted him to communion as a bishop of the Church;² and Basilides, furnished with

¹ *Ep.* lxxvii. *ad clerum et plebes in Hispaniâ consistentes*, *Opp.*, ii. 735-743.

² A question may be raised as to the precise character of the pope's action in this case; whether, that is, he simply admitted the deposed bishops to his communion, notwithstanding the sentence of the Spanish bishops, which would be bad enough; or whether he attempted in any way to declare authoritatively that they were restored to their bishoprics, which would be far worse. The learned French Roman Catholic critic, Dupin, in the appendix to the 5th (al. 6th) volume of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques* (pp. 185-188), argues in favour of the first of these explanations. Whatever it was that the pope did, S. Cyprian and the African bishops held that it was wrong, and advised the Spanish bishops to ignore it. In the text I have preferred to take the more

letters of communion from the pope, returned to Spain and canvassed to be restored to the see which he had resigned. Martialis seems to have followed the same course. At any rate, in some way, not fully described, he tried by "deceit" to get put back into his bishopric. Certain bishops, following the pope's bad example, admitted both Basilides and Martialis to their communion. The result of all this was that the churches in Spain were thrown into confusion; and in their trouble they wrote to S. Cyprian for his advice and aid. Their application was discussed in a synod, consisting of thirty-seven African bishops, over whom S. Cyprian presided. It is interesting to observe what action S. Cyprian and the African synod took. Did they say with the Vatican Council that "the judgement of the apostolic see cannot be revised by any one, and that no one may pass judgement on its decisions"? Did they say that "all the pastors and all the faithful are bound to the pope by the obligation of true obedience"? Did they therefore exhort the Spanish Catholics to restore the deposed bishops to communion, and to take counsel with the pope as to their being reinstated in their sees? or, if that seemed impossible, did they suggest that a humble petition should be sent to Rome, begging that the case might be reheard? They say nothing of the kind. They say that Felix and Sabinus are in full canonical possession of their sees; and that the mistaken action of the pope "cannot rescind an ordination rightly performed." They say that the effect of what took place at Rome was not to efface but to increase the crimes of Basilides. They say that, although some of the bishops (and the pope was one of them) think that the heavenly discipline of the Church is to be neglected, and rashly communicate with Basilides and Martialis, this ought not to disturb our faith, since the Holy Spirit threatens such bishops in the Psalms, saying, "But thou hatest to be reformed, and hast cast My words behind thee: when thou sawest a thief, thou consentedst unto him, and hast been partaker with the adulterers." They express their belief that these bishops, who are mingled in unlawful communion with sinners who abstain from doing penance, are polluted with the commerce of the guilty, and being joined in the guilt are not separate in the punishment. Finally, they exhort the Spanish Catholics to pay no heed to the action of the pope, and to refuse to communicate with the two profane and polluted bishops, who had been deposed.

The whole incident illustrates admirably the Catholic

charitable view of Stephen's action. On p. 61, n. 1, will be found a short account of a similar application made by the "Tall Brothers" to S. Chrysostom, whose action was much more in accordance with the canons than was that of Stephen.

system of Church government. The sentence of the synod of the province is held to be final. The pope's decision in regard to a matter which had taken place outside his jurisdiction, is considered to have no force in itself. It is neither able to reverse nor suspend the decision of the province. The Spanish churches are exhorted to ignore it; and all who act upon it are warned that they will share in the guilt and in the punishment of the miserable men whose actions had caused all the trouble. We learn also from this incident that when any church was in trouble, it could apply for help to any foreign church which it might select.¹ It might apply to Rome, if it chose, as the bishops of Gaul did in the case of Marcianus; but it might apply also to Carthage, if it preferred that course, as the Catholics of Spain did in the present instance. The African bishops had normally no right to exercise jurisdiction in Spain, any more than the Bishop of Rome had either in Spain or in Gaul; but they could give advice and comfort, and could help to strengthen the Spanish churches in maintaining the wholesome discipline of the gospel.²

S. Cyprian's action in this Spanish dispute is an admirable illustration of what S. Gregory Nazianzen meant, when he said that Cyprian "presided not only over the Church of Carthage and over Africa, . . . but also over all the countries of the West, and over nearly all the regions of the East and of the South and of the North."³ It is scarcely necessary to add that this presidency which S. Cyprian exercised was not (outside of Africa) a presidency of *jurisdiction*, but a presidency of *love* and *honour*, and, as a consequence, of *influence*.

Hitherto I have been speaking about acts and words of S. Cyprian, which are generally held to have preceded the breaking out of the quarrel between Carthage and Rome on the subject of the validity of heretical baptism.⁴ Let us now proceed to consider the light which that quarrel throws on

¹ Church history is full of the records of such applications, made either by churches or by individuals. To name one celebrated case, which occurred about a century and a half later. When the "Tall Brothers" had been most unjustly excommunicated by Theophilus of Alexandria, they took refuge with S. Chrysostom at Constantinople, who very rightly refused to admit them to the participation of the Mysteries, until their case had been judicially investigated; but he permitted them to be present at the Holy Sacrifice among the *consistentes*; and he wrote to Theophilus, "desiring him to receive them back into communion, as their sentiments concerning the Divine Nature were orthodox" (cf. Sozomen, *H. E.*, viii. 13). It need hardly be said that S. Chrysostom had no jurisdiction over Theophilus.

² See Additional Note 23, p. 451.

³ *Orat.* xxiv. 12, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 445.

⁴ Possibly, however, the case of the Spanish bishops may have occurred during the baptismal controversy.

the position of the see of Rome in the Cyprianic age. I shall not attempt to go fully into the controversy, but shall confine myself strictly to that which has a bearing on our general subject. The rough outline of the dispute must be familiar to every one here. S. Cyprian, and the African bishops generally, rebaptized converts from the sects, whether they had been previously baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity or not. The Africans considered that all baptism administered by persons living in heresy or schism was invalid. With the Africans agreed the bishops of Asia Minor, under which term I include Phrygia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, and other neighbouring provinces.¹ The Roman Church accepted the baptism of heretics and schismatics as valid when the right form had been used, and refused in such cases to rebaptize converts from heresy or schism, but admitted them into the Church, after proof of repentance and faith, by confirmation. Both sides appealed confidently to ancient tradition and custom. S. Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, says that the custom of rebaptizing heretics, which was maintained in Asia Minor, was based on that which had been "delivered by Christ and His apostles."² "Nor do we," he says, "remember that this ever had a beginning among us, since it has ever been observed here." On the other hand, the very able author of the treatise *De Rebaptismate* speaks of the usage upheld by Stephen as agreeing with "most ancient custom, and with the tradition of the Church," and as being "an old and memorable and most established observance of all the veteran saints and believers," and which has in its favour "the authority of all the churches."³ Both sides had a great deal to say for themselves. We in England at the present day follow the practice which was upheld by Stephen, but we have no right to say that it is the only allowable practice. The controversy has never been decided by an authority which binds the whole Church. It is very commonly supposed that the Council of Nicaea settled the matter in favour of the custom of Pope Stephen, but that is a mistake. S. Athanasius, who must have known if any such action had been taken, says, "How should not the baptism which the Arians administer be wholly vain and profitless, having a semblance but nothing real as an aid to holiness?"⁴ and the post-Nicene Eastern

¹ See Additional Note 24, p. 453.

² *Ep. S. Firmil., inter Cyprianicas* lxxv., § 19, *Opp.*, ii. 822.

³ *Lib. de Rebapt.*, ap. S. Cyprian. *Opp.*, iii. 69-92. Dr. Mason, speaking of the authorship of this treatise, says, "It seems safe to consider" it "as the production of one of the prelates in the *entourage* of Stephen" (*Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 124). See Additional Note 25, p. 453.

⁴ *Cf. Orat. ii., contr. Ariann.*, §§ 42, 43. See Dr. Pusey's *Note G on*

Fathers for the most part teach that baptism administered by heretics is invalid, even though the right formula be used ; but they also hold that the Church can, by a high exercise of its authority, validate that which of itself would be invalid. This seems to be the view of the Eastern Church up to the present time.¹ However, our business is with the controversy between S. Cyprian and Pope Stephen. The question had been discussed for more than a year in Africa before it was brought to the knowledge of Stephen. But in A.D. 256 a council was held at Carthage, at which seventy-one bishops were present. S. Cyprian presided ; and in the name of the council he wrote to Stephen, reporting the decision at which the assembled bishops had arrived.² He informs the pope that the council had determined that those "who have been baptized without the Church, and have among heretics and schismatics been tainted by the defilement of profane water, when they come . . . to the Church . . . ought to be baptized ;" and he concludes his letter thus : "These things, dearest brother, by reason of the office which we share and our single-hearted affection, we have brought to thy knowledge, believing that what is alike religious and true will, according to the truth of thy religion and faith, be approved by thee also." We must observe that S. Cyprian hardly seems to realize that he is writing to one on whom had "been divinely conferred the gift of never-failing truth and faith,"³ as was the case if the Vatican decrees are true. He does not submit the decision of his province to the pope's infallible correction. He tells his correspondent that the African decision is "alike religious and true," and he expresses his belief that, as the pope is also a religious man, he will agree with what has been decided. No doubt he had a shrewd suspicion that the pope would disagree, and he therefore adds, "But we know that some will not lay aside what they have once imbibed, nor easily change their resolves, but, without interruption to the bonds of peace and concord with their colleagues, retain certain peculiarities which have once grown into usage among themselves."⁴ He then proceeds to add that he does not propose to enforce the African view

Tertullian (Lib. Fath. tr., pp. 286, 287), and Dr. Bright's Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils, pp. 67, 68 (Nicaea, xix.), and compare the authorities mentioned in the Additional Note 26 on p. 453. On the whole subject see The Minister of Baptism, by the Rev. W. Elwin, a very learned and thorough book ; but Mr. Elwin hardly does justice, as it seems to me, to the strength of the argument in favour of the validity of heretical baptism.

¹ See Elwin, pp. 80, 86, 132, 267, 268 ; compare Gore's *Church and the Ministry* (1st edit., p. 194, n. 2).

² *Ep. lxxii. ad Stephanum, Opp.*, ii. 775-778.

³ *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486, 487.

⁴ See Additional Note 27, p. 454.

by cutting off the pope from his communion if he disagrees ; he considers that this is a matter in which the two views may co-exist side by side in the Church. His words are : "In this matter we neither do violence nor give the law to any one, since each bishop hath, in the administration of the Church, his own choice and will free, hereafter to give an account of his conduct to the Lord. We bid you, dearest brother, ever heartily farewell." How is it possible to suppose that S. Cyprian could have written in this strain, if he had believed the pope to be the infallible monarch of the Church ? His words breathe throughout the spirit of brotherly equality.

To this letter Pope Stephen wrote a harsh reply, which unfortunately has not been preserved, although small fragments of it may be found embedded in the letters of S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian. S. Cyprian, when referring to it, speaks of the "proud," "impertinent," "inconsistent remarks," which Stephen had written "rashly and improvidently." He refers to the bursting forth of "the harsh obstinacy of our brother Stephen." He asks, "Does he [Stephen] give honour to God, who, the friend of heretics and the enemy of Christians, deems the priests of God, maintaining the truth of Christ and the unity of the Church, worthy of excommunication ?"¹ It is evident from these words that the pope had threatened to excommunicate the African Church if the bishops of that church continued to maintain their practice in regard to the rebaptism of heretics. Stephen was therefore attempting to issue a command, and to enforce it by every weapon that he had at his disposal. If it be indeed true, as the Vatican Council teaches, that "all the pastors and all the faithful . . . are bound to the authority of the pope by the obligation of true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in things pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world,"² now was the time for S. Cyprian and the African bishops to show that they realized their obligation. What actually happened was this : S. Cyprian convoked another council, at which eighty-five bishops were present.³ At its first meeting, in his

¹ *Ep.* lxxiv. *ad Pompeium contra epistolam Stephani*, *Opp.*, ii. 799-805. S. Augustine was referring to S. Cyprian's indignant remarks about Stephen in this letter to Pompeius, when he said (*De Bapt.*, v. 25, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ix. 158), "I will not review what he poured out against Stephen under irritation, because there is no need to do so." S. Augustine, who was arguing against the Donatists, had been reviewing the principal points in this letter of S. Cyprian, but the latter's personal remarks about Stephen had no bearing on S. Augustine's controversy with the Donatists, though they have a bearing on our controversy with Rome. S. Augustine adds that "although S. Cyprian was somewhat moved by his indignation, yet it was in a brotherly way" (*quamvis commotius, sed tamen fraterne indignaretur*).

² See p. 4.

³ See Additional Note 28, p. 454.

opening speech, he said, "It remains for us each to deliver our sentiments on this matter, judging no one, nor removing any one, if he be of a different opinion, from the right of communion. *For no one of us sets himself up to be a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience*, since every bishop, according to the absolute independence of his liberty and power,¹ possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another. But let us all await the judgement of our Lord Jesus Christ, who singly and alone has the power both of setting us up in the government of His Church, and of judging our proceedings."² Obviously, when S. Cyprian says, "No one of us sets himself up to be a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience," he is alluding to St. Stephen's haughty attitude and to his threats of excommunication. So plain is the reference, that even Cardinal Baronius admits it.³ But if the pope be by divine appointment all that the Vatican Council has declared him to be, what words could be too strong to denounce S. Cyprian's attitude towards Stephen? On that hypothesis he was an insolent rebel; and his eighty-four colleagues, who made no protest, were sharers in his sin. Now, it so happens that S. Augustine has quoted these very words of S. Cyprian, and it is interesting to observe the impression which they made on him. Does he reprobate them as being rebellious? or does he try and excuse them by some charitable interpretation only half concealing his disapproval? He does neither of these things. He expresses his unqualified admiration.⁴ He says, "Quid mansuetius?

¹ "Pro licentiâ libertatis et potestatis suae." On the meaning of the word *licentia*, as an attribute of the episcopal authority, see Bishop Sage's *Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, chap. v., sections xl.-xliv. (*Works*, vol. iii. pp. 244-250, edit. 1846). It should be observed that "S. Cyprian uses the singular throughout. No one can judge or be judged by any other one. He does not say, no one can be judged by all, as though he were independent of the college collectively as well as individually, but the only One (*unus et solus*) who can judge a bishop is Christ Himself" (see an article on *Jurisdiction*, by John Walter Lea, *Union Review* for 1866, p. 363, n.).

² *Sententiæ Episcoporum*, *Opp.*, i. 435, 436.

³ Cf. Baron. *Annal.*, s.a. 258, § 42, ed. Antverp., 1617, ii. 521. In his own Italian province the pope was practically a bishop of bishops, as his brother of Alexandria was in Egypt and Libya (see note on p. 14). There is, however, no reason to suppose that either of these prelates ever called himself by that proud title. Tertullian, after he had become a rigid Montanist, applied the title "*bishop of bishops*" in bitter irony to Callistus (A.D. 217-222), who had been modifying the antique rigour of the penitential discipline of the Roman and of the Italian churches (see Tertull., *De Pudicit.*, cap. i., and compare S. Hippol. *Philosophum.*, ix. 7). S. Cyprian implies that Stephen, by his arrogant threats, "*constituted himself (se constituit) a bishop of bishops*" outside his own province. But the Africans would not give place in the least degree to these threats, or to the baseless claim which, either consciously or unconsciously, was implied in them.

⁴ S. Aug., *De Bapt.*, lib. iii. cap 3 (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1688, tom. ix. col. 110).

quid humilior?" "What can be more gentle? What more humble?" What fills him with admiration is that S. Cyprian¹ does not retort on Stephen the threats of anathema which the latter had so lavishly poured forth.² S. Augustine quotes S. Cyprian's words again further on, and he there remarks that they prove that S. Cyprian's "soul was peace-making and overflowing with the milk of charity."³ S. Augustine makes these laudatory remarks because he is absolutely unconscious of any taint of rebellion or of impropriety in S. Cyprian's attitude when he uttered these words. S. Augustine equally with S. Cyprian accepted the Catholic system of Church government, and knew nothing of the theories which the Vatican Council afterwards formulated and imposed under pain of anathema. S. Cyprian's words produced the same impression on him as they do on us, because his view and our view, in regard to the government of the Church, are substantially the same; whereas his view and the Ultramontane view are separated by an impassable gulf. S. Augustine's favourable judgement of S. Cyprian's general attitude is the more remarkable, because on the particular point in dispute he agreed absolutely with Stephen, and was therefore in disagreement with S. Cyprian. But he agreed with Stephen, not because he thought that Stephen was infallible, but because he considered that the doctrine and practice which Stephen maintained had been afterwards accepted by the Church. He never once suggests that S. Cyprian was wrong in having held to his own opinion in defiance of the pope's definition. He says that "without doubt holy Cyprian would have yielded, if the truth of this question had been thoroughly sifted, and declared, and established by a plenary council."⁴ But why should Cyprian need to wait for a plenary council, when the infallible pope had spoken, and had threatened to excommunicate those who differed from him? The answer, of course, is that nobody dreamed that obedience was due to the pope.⁵ Assuredly the eighty-five bishops who sat in council at Carthage took his view. They unanimously upheld the invalidity of heretical baptism, and repudiated the

¹ S. Jerome also dwells on the fact that S. Cyprian had put forth his views on the rebaptizing of heretics, without anathematizing those who disagreed with him; and he specially quotes S. Cyprian's letters to Stephen and Jubaianus, to show that he did not propose to enforce his views either on the pope or on other bishops, by separating them from his communion (cf. *Dial. adv. Lucif.*, 25, *P.L.*, xxiii. 179, 180).

² Cf. S. Aug., *De Bapt.*, v. 25, *Opp.*, lx. 158. See Additional Note 29, p. 458.

³ *Ibid.*, vi. 6, *Opp.*, tom. ix. col. 164.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ii. 4, *Opp.*, tom. ix. col. 98.

⁵ Archbishop Benson says (Smith and Wace, *D.C.B.*, i. 755), "Cyprian is totally unconscious of any claims made by the [Roman] see, and resists Stephen purely as an arrogant individual."

view put forth by Stephen, disregarding his threat of excommunication.

Having come to this decision, the council sent certain bishops¹ of their number as legates to the pope, to announce to him what they had decided. When these legates reached Rome, Stephen "would not admit them even to the common intercourse of speech;"² and "he commanded the whole brotherhood, that no one should admit them into his house; so that not only peace and communion, but shelter and hospitality were denied them."³ These facts we learn from S. Firmilian's letter to S. Cyprian; a letter written in Greek, but translated into Latin in part by S. Cyprian, and published under his authority,⁴ and forming part of the Cyprianic correspondence, which happily still remains. S. Firmilian also tells us that Stephen carried out what he had threatened, and cut off the Church of North Africa from his communion.⁵ Moreover, the pope had shortly before excommunicated the Churches of Cappadocia, Cilicia, Galatia, and the neighbouring provinces, because they, like the Church of North Africa, were accustomed to re-baptize heretics.⁶ The excommunication of the Easterns is mentioned not only by S. Firmilian, but also by S. Denys the Great of Alexandria,⁷ who, though agreeing with Stephen on the disputed question of heretical baptism, strongly disapproved of the high-handed way in which he was trying to enforce his views. The excommunication of the Africans is not only distinctly mentioned by S. Firmilian, but is implied in the way in which the pope treated the African bishops who came to Rome as legates from the Carthaginian council.⁸ It must have been after

¹ "Legatos episcopos" (*Ep. S. Firmil., inter Cyprianicas lxxv.*, § 25, *Opp.*, ii. 826).

² *Ep. S. Firmil., ut supra.*

³ *Loc. cit.*

⁴ Bossuet (*Gallia Orthodoxa*, cap. lxx.) says, "Consensit ei [sc. Firmiliano] Cyprianus, ejusque epistolam Latinam fecit, et ad ecclesias edidit." Compare Tillemont, iv. 158. The Bollandist Father Bossue (*Acta SS.*, tom. xii. Octobr., p. 491), after mentioning that Rigault and Dom Maran were of opinion that S. Firmilian's letter was translated into Latin by S. Cyprian, says, "Similiter sentiunt Tillemontius *aliquæ passim.*" Compare Archbishop Benson's note x., in Smith and Wace, *D.C.B.*, i. 751; and see Additional Note 30, p. 458.

⁵ "Te a tot gregibus scidisti. Excidisti enim te ipsum." "Quid enim humilium aut lenius quam cum tot episcopis per totum mundum dissensisse, pacem cum singulis vario discordiæ genere rumpentem, modo cum Orientalibus . . . modo vobiscum, qui in meridie estis" (*Ep. S. Firmil., inter Cyprianicas lxxv.*, §§ 24, 25, *Opp.*, ii. 825, 826).

⁶ See Additional Note 31, p. 458.

⁷ Euseb., *H. E.*, vii. 7. To avoid confusion between S. Dionysius the Great of Alexandria and his contemporary, S. Dionysius of Rome, I use the English form, Denys, when speaking of the Alexandrine saint.

⁸ According to primitive practice, even ordinary Christian laymen, when travelling, if they brought letters of communion from their own bishop, were received in hospitality, and diligently cared for, as well-known and dear friends

Stephen had separated S. Cyprian from his communion¹ that the latter sent a letter to S. Firmilian of Caesarea. This prelate was himself a saint, and was the friend of saints. S. Denys the Great speaks of him as one of the most illustrious bishops of his time.² He was closely united in brotherly love with S. Gregory the Wonder-worker. The great Council of Antioch,³ which condemned Paul of Samosata, and which was held shortly after the deaths of S. Denys and of S. Firmilian, couples them together, describing them as "men of blessed memory" (τοὺς μακαρίτας). S. Basil quotes S. Firmilian as an authority on doctrine.⁴ S. Gregory of Nyssa, preaching a panegyric on S. Gregory the Wonder-worker, compares the virtue of S. Firmilian to the virtue of S. Gregory. The Church has been accustomed to celebrate his festival on the 28th of October. Even Cardinal Baronius, who for very obvious reasons excluded his name from the Roman Martyrology, is obliged to admit that "scarcely any of his contemporaries appeared to surpass him in learning and sanctity."⁵ It was natural that the glorious S. Cyprian, when in trouble, should write to his brother saint of Cappadocia. I have already referred to S. Firmilian's reply; but it will be well to make one or two quotations from it, as illustrating the view which great saints of the third century took of Stephen's action. S. Firmilian says that, though in past times there has been in different provinces much variety in the way in which the sacramental ordinances have been celebrated, yet hitherto there had not been on that account any "departure from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church. This Stephen has now dared to make, breaking the peace with you [Cyprian], which his predecessors ever maintained with you in mutual affection

(cf. Sozom., v. 16). This was the *contesseratio hospitalitatis* spoken of by Tertullian as a mark of communion between different churches (*De Praescript. haeret.*, xx.). When the pope forbade hospitality to be shown to the bishops sent as legates by the North African Church, he was manifesting in the most public fashion that the Roman see had completely separated herself from the communion of that church. Tillemont (iv. 155) rightly says, "Cette action paroist une rupture entière." The whole of Tillemont's 49th article on S. Cyprian should be studied.

¹ For further proof that Stephen not merely wrote threats, but actually separated S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian from his communion, see Appendix A, pp. 72-77.

² Euseb., *H. E.*, vii. 5.

³ "Le plus celebre Concile qui ait été tenu dans l'Église avant celui de Nicée" (Tillemont, iv. 308). Cardinal Newman, in an article which appeared in the *Atlantis* in July, 1858, and which its author republished in 1871, as note iv., appended to the third edition of the *History of the Arians* (p. 443), speaks of the Fathers of this council as being "bishops of the highest authority."

⁴ Tillemont, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Baron. *Annal.*, s.a. 258, § 47. See also Duchesne (*Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 437).

and respect.”¹ From another passage we learn that Stephen had laid stress on the fact that he was the successor of S. Peter in S. Peter's own chair. Firmilian says, “I am justly indignant at such open and manifest folly in Stephen, that he who so boasts of the seat of his episcopate, and contends that he holds the succession from Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid, introduces many other rocks, and buildeth anew many churches. . . .” “Stephen, who proclaims that he occupies by succession the chair of Peter, is roused by no zeal against heretics.”² Further on S. Firmilian apostrophizes Stephen indignantly. He says, “What strifes and dissensions hast thou stirred up through the churches of the whole world! And how great a sin hast thou heaped up against thyself, when thou didst cut thyself off from so many flocks! For thou didst cut thyself off; deceive not thyself; for he is truly the schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of the unity of the Church. For while thou thinkest that all may be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all. . . .”³ “This is to have kept the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, to cut himself off from the unity of charity, and in all things to make himself an alien to the brethren, and with the fury of contumacious discord to rebel against the sacrament and the faith!”⁴ These are doubtless strong words. They are the fervent utterances of a saint indignant at the schismatic course which was being taken by the bishop of the first see in the Church.⁵ Stephen had no right to complain. He had dared to call the blessed S. Cyprian a “false Christ,” a “false apostle,” a “deceitful worker,”⁶ and it was quite time that the prelates of the Church should speak out in no faltering terms of his arrogant attitude and action. This task S. Firmilian undertook; and we may be sure that S. Cyprian approved, because there can be no doubt that he edited the Latin translation of S. Firmilian's letter, and authorized its

¹ *Ep. S. Firmil., inter Cyprianicas lxxv., § 6, Opp., ii. 813.*

² *Ep. cit., § 17, p. 821.*

³ *Ibid., § 24, p. 825.*

⁴ *Ibid., § 25, p. 826.*

⁵ Dom Maran, the Benedictine editor of S. Cyprian's works, rightly says that “the love of unity breathes through the whole of Firmilian's Epistle” (*Vit. S. Cypri., cap. xxxii., Opp. S. Cypr., ed. Ben., col. cxx.*). Baluze makes a similar observation (*Opp., S. Cypr. ed. Ben., p. 513*).

⁶ S. Firmilian, in his letter to S. Cyprian, quotes these reviling words of Stephen (p. 827); Dom Maran points out that we have also S. Cyprian's own witness that the words were actually used by Stephen, because Cyprian “translated Firmilian's epistle into Latin, or at least authorized its publication” (*Vita S. Cypri., cap. xxx., Opp. S. Cypr., ed. Ben., col. cxiii.*). It is obvious that Stephen would never have used, in a public document, such words about a great prelate like the Bishop of Carthage, if he had been still in communion with him.

publication, that it might edify and instruct the Western portion of the Church.¹

Shortly afterwards, under the Emperor Valerian, the persecution broke out afresh, and Stephen is said to have died a martyr's death. If he did so die, we may hope that he purged away in that second baptism whatever was amiss in his life.² The dispute about baptism still went on in the time of his successor, S. Xystus;³ but Xystus was "a good and peace-making bishop,"⁴ and he seems to have undone the harsh acts of his predecessor, and thus to have brought back the Roman Church into full unity with the churches of the East and of the South.⁵ As it was in the Paschal

¹ See note 4 on p. 67.

² The Roman Church invokes him as a saint. But it must be observed that Bishop Pearson throws doubt on the alleged martyrdom of Stephen. He says (*Annal. Cypr.*, s.a. 257, § v., p. 60), "Pontii tamen verba prætereunda non sunt: 'Jam de Xysto bono et pacifico sacerdote, ac propterea beatissimo martyre, ab urbe nuntius venerat,' quibus Stephanum videtur perstringere, eumque negare, aut omnino martyrium subiisse, aut si subierit, verum et beatum martyrem fuisse." Mgr. Duchesne evidently takes the same view as Pearson. He says (*Liber Pontificalis*, p. 154, note 1), "Il semble donc que l'ancienne tradition liturgique, antérieure à la *Passio Stephani* ait été muette sur son martyre. Et ceci s'explique d'autant mieux que Saint Augustin ne paraît en avoir rien su (*vide* Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. 594), et que le diacre Pontius, biographe de S. Cyprien, se sert en parlant de Xystus II., d'une expression qui semble exclure le martyre de son prédécesseur (c. 14, p. cv., Hartel)." Compare also *Lib. Pont.*, p. xcvi., and *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 438, n. 3. See Additional Note 32, p. 459.

³ This is clear from the letters of S. Denys the Great, parts of which are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.*, vii. 5, 7, 9).

⁴ "Bonus et pacificus sacerdos." As has been already pointed out, they are the words which are used concerning Xystus by S. Cyprian's deacon and biographer, S. Pontius (*Vita S. Cypr. per Pont. Diac.*, § 14, ap. *Opp. S. Cypr.*, iii. cv.).

⁵ There is clear proof that S. Dionysius, the successor of S. Xystus, was in full communion with S. Firmilian (cf. S. Basil. *Ep. lxx. ad Damasum*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1730, iii. 164). I am inclined to think that "the good and peace-making" Xystus may have annulled the acts of his predecessor, or, at any rate, may have receded from them, in consequence of the letters of S. Denys of Alexandria (cf. Tillemont, iv. 160, 161). S. Denys wrote first to Stephen on the very grave difficulties which would arise out of his harsh action, and "entreated him" to follow a gentler course; but on Stephen he seems to have produced no effect. If Stephen had yielded, the controversy would have come to an end. S. Denys then wrote twice to two Roman priests, namely, Dionysius, afterwards pope, and Philemon, and he seems to have led them to change their views, so that they were more inclined to peace. Speaking of the way in which Stephen had thrown the churches of Asia Minor "into strife and contention," he says in one of his letters to Philemon, "I cannot endure" it. Then he wrote two letters, still on the same subject, to Pope S. Xystus, in one of which he recounts his previous efforts on behalf of peace. We may well believe that the "peace-making" propensities of the "good" Xystus prompted him to accede to the entreaties of his brother-saint of Alexandria, and to recede from the separatist position which Stephen had taken up. There was a final letter on baptism addressed by S. Denys and the whole Church of Alexandria to S. Xystus and the whole Church of Rome. This may well have been a letter of congratulation on the restoration of peace to the Church. Eusebius implies that in this final letter the whole subject of the rebaptism of heretics and of the toleration of variations of discipline in connexion with that matter was reviewed at length. The preceding summary of S. Denys' action is based on Euseb. *H. E.*, vii. 5, 7, 9.

controversy, so it was in the Baptismal controversy; it was Rome that was compelled to give way, as it was Rome that had advanced unjustifiable claims. Africa and Asia Minor retained their baptismal discipline unchanged,¹ and had the joy of welcoming back the Roman Church after its wanderings into the straight path of Catholic peace and charity. This happened before the martyrdom of S. Cyprian.

Perhaps it was to make some atonement for the outrageous way in which he had been treated by Stephen, that the Roman Church has paid such special honour to S. Cyprian ever since his glorious death. His name is apparently the name of the only man, neither martyred at Rome nor belonging to the local Church of Rome, which finds a place in the canon of the Mass, as used to this day in the Roman Church.² It seems to me probable that his name was inserted in the canon by Pope S. Dionysius, the successor of S. Xystus. This latter died five or six weeks before S. Cyprian, and S. Dionysius was consecrated to the Roman see a few months after S. Cyprian's martyrdom, that see having remained vacant during the interval; so that, if S. Cyprian's name was inserted at the time when his death was still fresh in the minds of all Catholics, the insertion would have taken place by S. Dionysius' authority. It is interesting to notice that S. Denys the Great speaks in one of his letters of his namesake of Rome, as having "*formerly held the same opinion as Stephen*"³ in regard to that pope's high-handed policy of excommunication. The words seem to imply that S. Dionysius had changed his mind, and had been led to favour a more Christian mode of action. Following up this clue, it is worthy of observation that S. Dionysius, during his pontificate, wrote to the Church of Caesarea in Cappadocia,⁴ while S. Firmilian was still its bishop, to console it for the sufferings inflicted on it by the barbarians. He even sent agents into Cappadocia to ransom Christians of S. Firmilian's diocese, who had been carried away into captivity. I like to think of this great pope making some reparation for the treatment which S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian had received at the hands of his predecessor Stephen.

On the whole, I submit that, whether we look at the

¹ See Additional Note 33, p. 460.

² The names of the apostles and of other saints mentioned in Holy Scripture must of course be excepted.

³ Euseb., *H. E.*, vii. 5.

⁴ S. Basil. *Ep.* lxx. *ad Damasum, Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1730, iii. 164. S. Firmilian was Bishop of Caesarea during the whole of the pontificate of Dionysius, with the exception of the last two months. They both died in the year 268; S. Firmilian in October, and S. Dionysius in December. The news of S. Firmilian's death would hardly have reached Rome during the two months that remained of S. Dionysius' lifetime.

history of the Paschal controversy in the time of Pope Victor, or to the celebrated passage about the Roman Church in the great treatise of S. Irenaeus, or to the line of action which S. Cyprian pursued in his dealings with the popes of his day,¹ we find that the witness of the first three centuries is entirely adverse to the papal theory set forth in the Vatican decrees, and that it bears out that view of the position of the Roman see which I attempted to sketch in my first lecture.

APPENDIX A.

The Excommunication of S. Cyprian (see p. 68).

SOME Roman Catholic writers have done their best to make out that Pope Stephen, in his dealings with S. Cyprian, never proceeded beyond *threats* of excommunication, and that no actual rupture took place. It is difficult to understand how such a view could ever have been seriously taken; but it is easy to see that Ultramontanes would naturally shrink from admitting that so illustrious a saint as Cyprian persisted in upholding the opinion concerning baptism which he had inherited from his predecessors, if the retaining of that opinion had resulted in his being separated from the communion of the Roman Church. If S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian were really excommunicated, and if they nevertheless refused to alter either the teaching or the practice condemned by Rome, then it is clear that neither of these saints nor their colleagues in Africa and Asia Minor could have considered that communion with the pope was an essential matter. It would follow from this conclusion that their witness would have to be reckoned as adverse to the truth of the Ultramontane theory concerning the papacy. Having thus pointed out the importance of the question, I proceed to discuss it.

I have quoted in my second lecture the clear statements of S. Firmilian on the subject of the excommunication, but it will be worth while to repeat them in this place. Writing to S. Cyprian, after mentioning the fact that there had been in various matters a diversity of practice in the different provinces of the Church, he says, "And yet there has not been on that account at any time any departure from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church. This, Stephen has now dared to make, breaking the peace with you [Cyprian], which his predecessors

¹ I have discussed certain passages in S. Cyprian's writings, which are quoted by Ultramontanes as if they favoured the papal claims, in Appendix B, with its *Addendum*, pp. 77-95, to which the reader is referred.

ever maintained with you in mutual affection and respect.”¹ And further on in the same letter S. Firmilian apostrophizes Stephen, and says, “How great a sin hast thou heaped up against thyself, when thou didst cut thyself off from so many flocks! For thou didst cut thyself off. Deceive not thyself. For he is truly the schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of the unity of the Church. For while thou thinkest that all may be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all.”² Then he goes into particulars about the way in which Stephen had treated the bishops sent to Rome as envoys or legates by the synod of the North African Church; how Stephen “would not admit them even to the common intercourse of a conference,” and how “he commanded the whole brotherhood that no one should receive them into his house; so that not only peace and communion, but shelter and hospitality, were denied them on their arrival.”³ Yet in the face of all this, Dr. Rivington says, “There is *no* evidence that S. Cyprian was *ever* under excommunication.”⁴ It seems incredible that such a statement should be made. Evidence there clearly is, and more of the same kind might have been quoted. Later on Dr. Rivington reveals to us the theory by which he gets rid of the plain evidence of S. Firmilian. He says that, as the sentence, in which the statement concerning S. Cyprian’s excommunication occurs, “contains a most exaggerated account of the situation, we may feel ourselves at liberty to regard this statement also as exaggerated.”⁵ Apparently Dr. Rivington bases his accusation of exaggeration on the words in S. Firmilian’s letter to S. Cyprian, in which the holy Bishop of Caesarea, rhetorically addressing Stephen, says, “While thou thinkest that all may be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all.” Concerning this sentence Dr. Rivington says, “Firmilian’s assertion was, indeed, flagrantly false, for it is notorious that Stephen did not stand alone.”⁶ Assuredly Dr. Rivington’s comment is a much more serious exaggeration than is the Saint’s very innocent remark. Obviously S. Firmilian writes with the assurance that his correspondent, S. Cyprian, who knew all the facts, would interpret his words in a reasonable way. By the words “*omnes*” and “*omnibus*” S. Firmilian does not mean all the churches of Christendom, but all those many flocks (*tot greges*), probably a majority of all the Catholic churches then in existence,⁷ which had been excommunicated by Stephen. From all these flocks Stephen had cut himself off by an excommunication, which was apparently not the outcome of a synod, but his own personal act. We have no reason to suppose that any other bishops had approved his proceeding or had made themselves parties to it. We know that S. Denys of Alexandria, who agreed with him in regard to the main point in dispute, strongly disapproved of his harsh method of enforcing the view which they held in common.⁸ But even if, for the sake of argument, it were conceded that

¹ *Ep. S. Firmil., inter Cyprianicas lxxv.*, § 6, *Opp.*, ii. 813.

² *Ep. cit.*, § 24, p. 825.

³ *Ibid.*, § 25, p. 826.

⁴ *Authority*, p. 103, 2nd ed.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

⁷ See Additional Note 34, p. 460.

⁸ See p. 70, n. 5.

the use of the words “*omnes*” and “*solum*” was a serious exaggeration, it would not follow that one could rightly treat as an exaggeration S. Firmilian’s repeated statement that a breach of communion really took place, corroborated as that statement is by the details given in regard to the treatment of the legates, details which Firmilian must have learnt from S. Cyprian, and still further corroborated, as we shall see in the sequel, by the words of S. Denys, and by the share which S. Cyprian must have had in the translation and publication of S. Firmilian’s letter. Anyhow, it is absurd to say that “there is no evidence that he [Stephen] ever proceeded to execute his threat.” I am aware that other Roman Catholic writers have taken the same line as Dr. Rivington. The fact is that they are driven into a corner, and that the simplest way of escape is to deny the truth of the evidence, however well attested it may be. But, in justice to our brethren of the Roman communion, it must not be supposed that their best writers follow such a hopeless course. Such a course would be impossible to a historian like Tillemont; but I prefer to quote an authority from the south side of the Alps. I know of no greater name among Ultramontane historians of the last century than that of Archbishop Mansi of Lucca, best known by his great edition of the Councils.¹ Mansi, in his animadversion on Natalis Alexander’s dissertation concerning the subject which we are discussing, says, “So openly does Firmilian write to S. Cyprian that Pope Stephen broke the peace, and that he accordingly deprived them of his communion, that it seems that it cannot be doubted that he went beyond threats and at length pronounced sentence of excommunication against them.” Mansi proceeds to quote S. Firmilian’s words, and to show that they are decisive in favour of his position. Then he adds, “But the answer of Natalis appears to be altogether futile. He says that Firmilian has described a mere threat of excommunication in the same terms as if it had really been fulminated, because he took up his pen when he was somewhat angry with Stephen. I say again that such an answer appears to me to be altogether futile, because it would necessarily follow that Firmilian had forgotten all the rules of Christian behaviour and of honesty, if, in order that he might excite odium against Stephen, he had lied in so serious a matter.² . . . And who, I ask, could conceive that, if Stephen had done no more than threaten, Firmilian would have compared him to the traitor Judas, and would have charged him with insolence, wickedness, and folly? Assuredly these are the words of one who is impatiently bearing a wound which he has received, and who is kindled with wrath against the man who has inflicted on him a deadly wound. . . . It is clear that Stephen broke the peace and refused communion, because he did not refrain from excommunicating Firmilian, Cyprian, and the others.”³ Mansi goes on to quote the letter of S. Denys of Alexandria to Pope S. Xystus II., a fragment of which

¹ The Jesuit professor of theology in the university of Innsbruck, Father Hurter, in his useful *Nomenclator Literarius* (iii. 101), speaking of Mansi, says, “De illo jam agemus, qui totâ hâc epochâ omnium fuit celeberrimus deque Ecclesiâ atque re literariâ optime meritus.”

² “In re tam gravi mentitus esset.”

³ *Animadvers. in Dissert. xii. Art. i., ap. Natal. Alexandr. Hist. Eccl., ed. 1786, Bing. ad Rhenum, tom. vi. pp. 222, 223.*

has been preserved by Eusebius. In that letter S. Denys, speaking of Stephen, says, "Indeed, he had previously (*πρότερον*) written concerning Helenus [of Tarsus] and concerning Firmilian, and concerning all [the bishops] of Cilicia and Cappadocia and Galatia, and of all the neighbouring nations, saying that he would not communicate with them either (*ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκέλευς κοινωνήσων*), for this same cause, namely, that they rebaptize heretics."¹ S. Denys, in his letter, so far as it has been preserved to us, deals entirely with Stephen's relations with the Eastern bishops, and says nothing of his relations with the Church of North Africa;² but Mansi points out that if the pope excommunicated the Easterns he must have excommunicated also the Africans, since the latter entirely agreed with the former in their teaching and practice.³ Thus the witness of S. Denys corroborates the witness of S. Firmilian and of S. Cyprian. Here we have a threefold cord, which will not easily be broken by any amount of *a priori* Ultramontane reasoning.

When it is once admitted that three contemporary writers of such high character, and of such esteem in the Church, as the three saints mentioned above, agree in their witness that an excommunication was not merely threatened but also pronounced and promulgated,⁴ and when it is also admitted that there is no shred of contemporary evidence on the other side, the discussion might fairly be brought to an end; but Natalis Alexander and others lay stress on the fact that S. Augustine, writing a century and a half later, seems to have thought that the estrangement between Rome and Carthage never amounted to a breach of communion.⁵ It is true that Tillemont does not so understand S.

¹ Euseb. *H. E.*, vii. 5. I have appended the original Greek of S. Denys' summary of the operative part of Stephen's letter, the English translation of which is italicized in the text. Mansi rightly translates these words as follows: "quod neque cum illis communicare vellet;" and Baronius renders the passage in the same way. I mention this, because De Valois has seriously altered the sense by translating S. Denys' words thus: "sese ab illorum communione discussurum." There is a difference between announcing that in the future you will not communicate with certain people, and announcing that in the future you will separate from their communion. The first formula implies that separation has already been effected, or is being effected by the document in which the formula occurs. The second formula threatens a separation in the future. S. Denys represents Stephen as having effected the separation, and not as having merely threatened it. See Additional Note 35, p. 462.

² See Additional Note 36, p. 462.

³ On this point Natalis Alexander would have agreed with Mansi. His words are express: "Una erat causa Firmiliani et Cypriani; . . . non est igitur verisimile quod Firmilianum communione privaverit Stephanus cum Orientalibus suis, et Cyprianum cum Africanis pace et communione frui permisit" (*Hist. Eccl.*, ed. 1786, tom. vi. p. 218).

⁴ The objection might be raised that, if Eusebius had supposed that Stephen had actually excommunicated the Easterns, he would have given an exact account of how the breach was healed. If Eusebius had lived some centuries later, when a papal excommunication was the direst thing that could happen to any Christian community, he would no doubt have done so; but Eusebius would not think of the matter quite in that light. In *H. E.*, v. 24, he gives an account of the excommunication of the Asians by Pope Victor, and he describes S. Irenaeus' mediation, as here he describes S. Denys' peace-making efforts, but neither there does he make mention of the close of the dispute.

⁵ Cf. S. Aug., *De Baptismo contra Donat.*, v. 25, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1688, ix. 158, et *De unic. Bapt. contra Petil.*, cap. xiv., *Opp.*, ix. 538.

Augustine. He thinks that S. Augustine admits that the pope withdrew his communion from S. Cyprian, but he supposes that S. Augustine holds that, as S. Cyprian did not retort on the pope by a counter-excommunication, but remained united to him by the bond of charity, the breach was not complete.¹ Out of respect for the great name of S. Augustine, I will consider whether his view of the matter can really avail to counterbalance the evidence of the three contemporary saints, whose witness has been discussed above; and for the sake of conciseness I will take no account of Tillemont's explanation of S. Augustine's meaning, and I will assume that the latter really supposed that Stephen never withdrew his communion from S. Cyprian and from the other African bishops.

On that view of the case, I have no hesitation in saying that S. Augustine's representation of the matter cannot possibly avail to counterbalance the direct testimony of S. Firmilian and S. Cyprian, confirmed as it is by the corroborative evidence of S. Denys; for there is every reason to believe that S. Augustine had not got the full evidence before him. The contemporary evidence of the excommunication of S. Cyprian, which has come down to us, is primarily contained in S. Firmilian's letter, which evidently re-echoed S. Cyprian's own dispatches, and for the translation and publication of which S. Cyprian was responsible. But that letter was not in the collection of the Cyprianic correspondence on the subject of the rebaptizing of heretics, which was in the hands of S. Augustine. The collecting of S. Cyprian's letters was a work of time. We now possess seven letters, either written by or to S. Cyprian on the question of rebaptism; but S. Augustine had only five of these in his collection. In his controversy with the Donatists he was obliged to go most minutely into the arguments about baptism contained in the Cyprianic documents. He discusses them clause by clause.² He actually takes the trouble to reply separately to each of the eighty-six speeches made by the eighty-five bishops who sat in the great Council of Carthage,³ over which Cyprian presided, and which was the last of the Cyprianic councils on rebaptism.⁴ So it comes to pass that we know exactly what documents S. Augustine possessed, and what were missing; and we find that he never refers either to the synodical letter⁵ written to Stephen by S. Cyprian in the name of the second of the three councils on rebaptism, or to the letter⁶ addressed to S. Cyprian by S. Firmilian.⁷

¹ Tillemont, iv. 150, 151.

² S. Aug., *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, libb. ii., iii., iv., v.

³ S. Cyprian, as president, made two speeches, the first and the last.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, libb. vi., vii.

⁵ S. Cypr. *Ep.* lxxii., *Opp.*, ii. 775.

⁶ *Ep. inter Cyprianicas* lxxv., *Opp.*, ii. 812.

⁷ S. Augustine's words, in his refutation of the speech of Crescens of Cirta (*De Bapt. contra Donat.*, vi. 15, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1688, ix. 171), show clearly that S. Cyprian's synodical letter to Stephen, which had been known to Crescens, was not known to him. Compare Mr. C. H. Turner's Note appended to Dr. Sanday's *Essay on the Cheltenham List* (*Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, iii. 324, 325). In his third book against Cresconius (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1688, ix. 435), S. Augustine implies that Cresconius had referred to "the letter of certain Orientals," as witnessing to their approval of S. Cyprian's doctrine about rebaptism. He quotes in the second chapter some words from Cresconius, which seem to me to imply that this letter was a synodical epistle expressing the formal assent of some

S. Augustine was quite aware that documents existed bearing on the controversy about baptism in the time of S. Cyprian, which had not come into his hands. He says in one place, "Not all the things which were transacted among the bishops at that time were committed to memory and to writing, and *not all the things which were so committed have come to my knowledge.*"¹ It is clear from all this that the whole evidence, as we now possess it, was not before S. Augustine; and in point of fact the last of the Cyprianic documents of which he had knowledge was the summarized report of the proceedings at the final council on rebaptism. *But that council preceded the excommunication;*² and it is therefore no matter for wonder that S. Augustine was unaware of the fact that a complete rupture finally took place. To put the whole matter briefly. The principal evidence for the excommunication is to be found in S. Firmilian's letter. That letter was not known to S. Augustine. It is perfectly clear from that letter that both S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian were excommunicated. We thus know of their excommunication from themselves. It seems unreasonable to set aside the best possible contemporary evidence in deference to certain *dicta* of S. Augustine, who lived a century and a half later, and had never seen the document which constitutes the principal proof. It is plain that the objections raised by Natalis Alexander have no real solidity. I submit that the excommunication of S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian and their colleagues by Pope Stephen must be accepted as historically true.³

APPENDIX B.

Concerning passages from S. Cyprian's works, which are quoted by Ultramontanes in support of their contention that S. Cyprian held the papal theory (see p. 72).

S. CYPRIAN'S witness in favour of the Catholic system of Church government and against the papal theory is consistently maintained throughout his acts and writings. But the Ultramontane divines

Eastern synod to the conclusions of the third Carthaginian Council on rebaptism. I doubt if S. Augustine had seen the letter; and the fact that it was written, not by one man, but by several, seems to me to be a proof positive that it was not the letter of S. Firmilian, with which we are acquainted. Tillemont (iv. 158) gives further reasons for concluding that S. Augustine had never seen S. Firmilian's letter to S. Cyprian.

¹ *De Bapt. contr. Donat.*, ii. 4, *Opp.*, ix. 98.

² Tillemont, iv. 155; and compare the *Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Septembr., pp. 305, 306, where Father Suyskens, S.J., the author of the Bollandist *Life of S. Cyprian*, replies to Dom Maran's arguments, and shows that the African legates, who were rejected by Stephen, were sent by the third council on rebaptism, and not by the second. Professor Jungmann (*Dissertationes Selectae in Hist. Eccl.*, tom. i. p. 331) takes the same view as Suyskens; and Hefele, who in his first edition had followed Maran, changed his mind, and in his second edition supports the view which I have taken in the text (see Hefele, vol. v. p. 434, Eng. trans.). See also the Additional Note 37, p. 463.

³ See Additional Note 38, p. 463.

naturally do what they can to discover passages which may seem to qualify the crushing force of his testimony against the later claims of Rome. Without attempting to exhaust the subject, I will take the passages from the Cyprianic documents which are quoted by Father Bottalla as supporting his views (*Supreme Authority of the Pope*, pp. 10-13), and will point out how consistent they are with S. Cyprian's general teaching in regard to the organization of the Church.

Father Bottalla says, "The Fathers and all Christian antiquity acknowledge the closest connexion between the unity of the Church as represented by Christ, and the headship of one universal pastor." In proof of this statement Father Bottalla quotes S. Cyprian's letter to Magnus (*Ep.* lxi. § 5, *Opp.*, ii. 753). S. Cyprian there says, "Wherefore the Lord, intimating to us a unity that cometh from a divine original, declareth and saith, 'I and the Father are one.' To which unity reducing His Church, He further saith, 'And there shall be one flock and one shepherd.'" ¹ S. Cyprian is quoting two passages from the tenth chapter of S. John's Gospel. The words of the second passage, as they were spoken by our Lord, referred to the one flock of the Catholic Church, consisting of Jews and Gentiles, under Himself the one Shepherd. S. Cyprian, however, in his application of the passage, somewhat varies from the original meaning. He is showing that each local church forms an organized unity under one head, the bishop. This is a very favourite subject with S. Cyprian. Magnus had asked him whether Novatians, on their conversion to the Church, ought to be rebaptized. S. Cyprian says, Yes, "for the Church is one, and, being one, cannot be both within and without. For if it was with Novatian, it was not with Cornelius. But if it was with Cornelius, who by a legitimate ordination succeeded the Bishop Fabian, . . . Novatian is not in the Church; nor can he be accounted a bishop, who, despising the evangelic and apostolic tradition, succeeding to nobody, has sprung from himself." The Novatian schism arose out of a dispute in the local Church of Rome. Two bishops, Cornelius and Novatian, claimed each of them to be the legitimate Bishop of Rome. It was not a question of the rights of the pope as against the rights of some other bishop or bishops. The question was, Which of two claimants is the rightful Bishop of Rome? S. Cyprian held that S. Cornelius was undoubtedly the true bishop. He had been consecrated first, and his election and consecration had been carried out in a thoroughly canonical and orderly way. He was the true successor to the previous bishop, Fabian. Afterwards Novatian was consecrated in an entirely uncanonical manner, when the see was no longer vacant. Novatian succeeded to nobody. It will now be evident that when S. Cyprian quotes our Lord's words, "There shall be one flock and one shepherd," he is referring to the local church at Rome, as it was when the Novatian schism began, and he is showing that the Roman flock had already its one shepherd, Cornelius, and that con-

¹ I give my own translation in the text. The Latin runs as follows: "Idcirco Dominus insinuans nobis unitatem de divinâ auctoritate venientem ponit et dicit: *Ego et Pater unum sumus. Ad quam unitatem redigens ecclesiam suam denuo dicit: Et erit unus grex et unus pastor.*"

sequently Novatian was a schismatical intruder, and that those who communicated with him shared in his guilt, and that those whom they baptized, according to S. Cyprian's notion, ought on their conversion to the Church to be rebaptized. There is not a single word in the whole epistle which deals with "the headship of one universal pastor" over the whole Catholic Church of Christ. So far from that being the case, the letter was written by S. Cyprian in the course of the controversy about rebaptism, which culminated in his excommunication by Stephen; and the whole letter is intended to prove to Magnus that the theories about the validity of schismatic baptism, which were favoured at Rome, were altogether wrong. Father Bottalla is unfortunate in his first Cyprianic quotation. Let us pass on to his second proof.

He says, "The same doctrine was inculcated by those confessors of Christ who returned from the Novatian schism to the unity of the Church." These confessors were members of the local Roman church, who had been imprisoned for the faith after the martyrdom of Pope S. Fabian in January, 250. For a whole year they witnessed a good confession for Jesus Christ. However, in the year 251 some of them were beguiled into giving their support to the party of Novatian, who was commencing his schism at Rome. S. Denys of Alexandria and S. Cyprian wrote letters of remonstrance to them, and finally they were led to see their mistake, and to sue for readmission into the Church. On their readmission, they confessed their error and made a profession of allegiance to S. Cornelius, as being their legitimate bishop. The whole dispute turned on the question, Who is the rightful Bishop of Rome? Both Cornelius and Novatian claimed to be the Bishop of the Catholic Church at Rome, and each one accused his rival of being the head of a schismatic body. The confessors' profession on their readmission was as follows: "We acknowledge that Cornelius is Bishop of the most holy Catholic Church [in this city], chosen by God Almighty and Christ our Lord. We confess our error; we have suffered from imposture. We were circumvented by crafty and perfidious speeches. For although we seemed, as it were, to have held a kind of communion with a schismatic and heretic, yet our mind was ever sincere in the Church. For we are not ignorant that there is one God, one Christ the Lord, Whom we confessed, one Holy Ghost, and that there ought to be one bishop in a Catholic church."¹ I have added in brackets the words "in this city," which express the true meaning. I see that Tillemont does the same. He says (iii. 460), "S. Cornelius reports word for word the act by which the confessors recognized him as the sole bishop of the Catholic Church [in Rome]." The confessors call the body adhering to Cornelius "the most holy Catholic Church," in contrast with the schismatic body adhering to Novatian. Father Bottalla tells us that "the name of Catholic Church is applied" in this passage "to the Church of Rome exclusively—that is, to S. Peter's chair—on account of its being the centre, the root, the source, and the matrix of Catholic unity." But such an interpretation is obviously very far-fetched. The relation of the

¹ *Ep. Cornelii ad Cypr. inter Cyprianicas* xlix. § 2, *Opp.*, ii. 611.

Roman see to Catholic unity was not in dispute. The question was, Who is the true occupant of that see? Which is the legitimate Catholic flock in Rome?

Father Bottalla proceeds, "In the same sense Pope Cornelius, in his epistle to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, used the following expression, pointing out the crime of Novatus: ¹ 'This asserter of the gospel did not know that there can be but one bishop in the Catholic Church.'" ² Unfortunately, Father Bottalla makes a slip in his translation of this passage. It should be, "that there can be but one bishop in a Catholic church," not "in the Catholic Church." S. Cornelius, who wrote to his brother of Antioch in Greek, ³ used the expression, ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, not ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. When this correction has been made, it will be at once perceived that the passage is useless for Father Bottalla's purpose. On the contrary, it helps to show that I have rightly interpreted the profession of allegiance made by the penitent confessors, for that profession was doubtless either drawn up or sanctioned by S. Cornelius; and the plain meaning of his letter to Fabius may be safely used to clear up phrases, if there are any, which may be thought ambiguous in the profession.

But let us now go back to Father Bottalla's statement that the Church of Rome is "the centre, the root, the source, and the matrix of Catholic unity." Truly, if that could be solidly proved, I should not care to write this book; and for the first time in my life I should begin to fear that the faith which God in His great mercy has ever given me in the Catholicity of my mother the Church of England, has been the result of some illusion. Father Bottalla refers in a note to S. Cyprian's forty-eighth letter, addressed to S. Cornelius; and he quotes S. Cyprian's words, "the womb and root of the Catholic Church," ⁴ by which words he supposes that S. Cyprian means to describe the Roman Church, as being the centre and source of Catholic unity. We English Churchmen have been taught that the Catholic Church diffused throughout all the world, in her essential unity, is the womb and root and mother and fountain-head of individual Catholics and of particular local churches, wherever they may be, whether at Rome, or at Canterbury, or at Oxford, or elsewhere. The whole Church is organically connected by the joints and bands of the apostolic faith and of the apostolical succession with the apostolic Church which was set up on earth by our Lord; and the whole Church is also organically connected, through her episcopate and through the Sacraments and through the operation and indwelling of the Holy Ghost, with her ascended Head, our Lord Jesus Christ, who holds the angels of the churches in His right hand. ⁵ All local churches derive

¹ Father Bottalla, following Eusebius, calls the anti-pope *Novatus*; but Eusebius is mistaken. The man's real name was Novatian. Novatus was a different person.

² Cf. Euseb. *H. E.*, vi. 43.

³ De Valois, the editor of Eusebius, conclusively shows in a note that the letter was written in Greek, as we have it in Eusebius.

⁴ "Ecclesiae Catholicae matricem et radicem" (*Ep.* xlvi. *ad Cornelium*, § 3, *Opp.*, ii. 607).

⁵ Cf. Rev. i. 20.

their being, as churches, from the apostolic Church. As Tertullian well expressed the matter, "These churches, so many and so great, are but that one primitive Church from the apostles, whence they all spring. Thus all are primitive, and all apostolical, while all are one."¹ Therefore the whole Church, in her unity and in her historical succession from the apostles, is the mother and womb and root of the particular local churches; and each local church, if she is abiding in Catholic unity, is the local representative of the whole, and shares in the attributes of the whole; so that each local Catholic church becomes, in consequence of her relation to the whole, the mother and womb and root of the individual Catholics who belong to her. This is true of the particular local church of Rome; but it is true equally of all other local churches. So we English Catholics have been taught, and so S. Cyprian in his day believed.² I will refer to a few passages which occur in his letters, so as to illustrate his view. In April, 251, the Council of Carthage, hearing of the dispute at Rome as to the succession to the bishopric of the church in that city, sent two African bishops, Caldonius and Fortunatus, to Rome with instructions to endeavour to pacify the quarrel between the followers of Cornelius and those of Novatian; and also to ascertain the truth as to whether the election and consecration of Cornelius had been canonical, and whether the charges brought against him by Novatian were supported by any solid evidence. Later on, when the African Church had been fully satisfied that Cornelius was the legitimate Roman Bishop, S. Cyprian wrote to him concerning the recent mission of Caldonius and Fortunatus as follows: "We lately sent, dearest brother, our colleagues Caldonius and Fortunatus; that not only by the persuasion of our epistles, but by their presence and the advice of you all, they might endeavour, as far as they could, and labour effectually to bring the members of the divided body to the unity of the Catholic Church and to join them [to it] by the bond of Christian love. But since the self-willed and inflexible obstinacy of the adverse party *has not only refused the bosom and embrace of their root and mother*,³ but has also, with discord increasing and widening worse and worse, appointed a bishop for itself, and, contrary to the mystery of the divine appointment and of Catholic unity once delivered, has set up an adulterous and opposed head without the Church; . . . we have directed our letters to you."⁴ Here it is evident that what S. Cyprian calls "*the root and mother*" is the unity of the Catholic Church, represented no doubt at Rome by the legitimate Bishop Cornelius and his flock of adherents. Cornelius and his party are not "*the root and mother*" because the pope is the centre of unity to the whole Church, but because they were recognized as legitimate by the whole Church, and because they joined in communion with her, and therefore represented her in Rome. In another letter, written about the same time, S. Cyprian urges the confessors who had got entangled in Novatian's party to "return to the

¹ *De Praescr. Haer.*, xx.

² See Additional Note 39, p. 464.

³ "*Radice et matris sinum adque complexum recusavit.*" See Additional Note 40, p. 464.

⁴ *Ep.* xlv. *ad Cornelium*, § 1, Opp., ii. 600.

Church your mother and to your brotherhood.”¹ They were to return to the Church their mother by recognizing Cornelius as their true bishop, who was himself recognized by the Catholic episcopate. The question whether Cornelius as pope had a primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church, did not arise. It was to the motherhood of the Church at large, not to any supposed ecumenical motherhood of the Roman see as such, that they were pressed to return.²

I pass on to the letter quoted by Father Bottalla, giving first a short explanation of the circumstances under which it was written. While the two African bishops, Caldonius and Fortunatus, were making their investigations in Rome, their colleagues in Africa determined that Cornelius should not be publicly recognized in Africa as the Roman bishop. The canonicity of his election had been disputed, and it was necessary that all doubts should be removed before the African Church committed herself as championing his side. It was therefore determined that, until a final decision should be given, official letters to the Roman Church should be addressed to the priests and deacons of that church, and not to Cornelius. This rule had been broken at Adrumetum through a mistake, and letters from that colony had been directed to Cornelius himself; but after a visit which S. Cyprian paid to Adrumetum, the mistake was rectified, and all subsequent letters to the Roman Church were for a time directed to the priests and deacons of that church, and not to the bishop.³ Cornelius noticed the change, and noticed also that the change had come about in consequence of S. Cyprian’s visit to Adrumetum, and he not unnaturally supposed that S. Cyprian was inclined to favour the claims of the anti-pope Novatian. Accordingly he wrote to S. Cyprian to expostulate. S. Cyprian, in his reply, gave a full explanation of the whole matter, and animadverted on the way in which the simplest incidents get misreported and misrepresented. Then he goes on to say, “We, who furnish all who sail hence with instructions,

¹ “Ad ecclesiam matrem et ad vestram fraternitatem revertamini” (*Ep.* xli. *ad Confessores Romanos*, § 2, *Opp.*, ii. 605).

² I do not for a moment deny that the local Roman church was in a certain sense the mother-church of large parts of the West, and more especially of the Italian churches; but there is no allusion to Rome’s position as the original spring of evangelization in the West, and as the ecclesiastical metropolis of Italy, in these expressions of Cyprian. He is dealing with a much more vital fact, namely, the motherhood which appertains to the Catholic Church, a society extending all over the known world. So in his seventy-third *Epistle to Jubaianus* (§ 24, *Opp.*, ii. 797), in a passage where there is not the remotest allusion to Rome or to the local church of Rome, he says that, when heretics understand that all baptism outside the Church is invalid, “they hasten to us more eagerly and more promptly, and implore the privileges and gifts of *Mother Church*” (*munera ac dona ecclesiae matris* implorant). And still more appositely, in his forty-seventh epistle (*Opp.*, ii. 605), which he sent to Cornelius, enclosing it as a covering letter along with his letter to the confessors, he says, referring to his letter to the confessors, “In my letter I would prevail with them, from mutual affection, to return to their mother, that is the Catholic Church” (*ad matrem suam, id est ecclesiam catholicam*). But the passages in which the whole Church is called our mother are practically innumerable.

³ These letters would, in the great majority of cases, be letters of commendation, introducing this or that African Catholic, who might be travelling to Rome, to the authorities of the church in the imperial city, and certifying to the fact that the bearer was in full communion with the Catholic Church.

lest in their voyage they any way offend, know well that we have exhorted them to acknowledge and hold fast to *the womb and root of the Catholic Church.*"¹ Evidently S. Cyprian meant by these words to warn his people against attending schismatic worship when away from Africa, and to urge them to find out, in every place where they might sojourn, the legitimate bishop who was recognized by the whole body of Catholic bishops. The church in communion with the legitimate bishop would be the true representative of the Catholic Church at large, and would in a subordinate way share with that Church the prerogative of being "the womb and root" of the children of God. Persons sailing from Africa would more often be on their way to Rome than any other place, because Rome was the capital of the empire, the metropolis of the civilized world. S. Cyprian therefore would certainly intend that his advice should be of help to his people, if they should chance to be in Rome; and in fact the reference to that advice in this letter to Cornelius shows that in S. Cyprian's mind the advice had a special bearing on the existing circumstances of the Roman Church. This fact will enable us to reject at once Father Bottalla's view that the Roman Church was itself "the womb and root," as being the centre of unity to the whole Catholic Church. For, on account of the schism raging in the local Church of Rome, the difficulty was to decide which was the true Church of Rome. If the Roman Church was itself "the womb and root," then, whether they joined Cornelius or Novatian, they would suppose that they had adhered to "the womb and root." But S. Cyprian's advice was evidently meant to help them to *discriminate*. He in effect tells them, "You must adhere to that party which shall prove itself to have a right to the communion of the Catholic Church. When you are on the spot, and know the circumstances, you will soon be able to find out which of the two parties has the better right. If you cannot decide, you must wait and see how the matter will be decided by the bishops in Africa and elsewhere. Whatever you do, take care to adhere to that party only which either is already or immediately will be, in fellowship with the Church at large. You must avoid separatist cliques, and abide in Catholic unity. So my advice is, Acknowledge² and hold fast to the womb and root of true Christians—I mean, your mother the Catholic Church."³ I do not doubt

¹ "Nos enim singulis navigantibus, ne cum scandalo ullo navigarent, rationem reddentes, scimus nos hortatos eos esse ut *ecclesiae catholicae matricem et radicem* agnoscerent ac tenerent" (*Ep.* xlvi. ad Cornelium, § 3, *Opp.*, ii. 607). The word "matrix" sometimes means "stem," which would agree well with "*radix*" (root), and would suit the sense as well as the more usual meaning "*womb*." But the fact that in *Ep.* xlv. S. Cyprian had joined *radix* with *mater*, seems to me to make the meaning "*womb*" the more probable. Bossuet, in his *Instruction Pastorale sur les Promesses de l'Église* (*Œuvres*, ed. 1816, xxii. 411, 412), favours the meaning "stem." He understands the *matrix et radix*, as I do, of the Church's unity: "cette tige, cette racine de l'unité" (p. 412). See Additional Note 41, p. 464.

² See Additional Note 42, p. 465.

³ From what I have said, it will, I hope, be clear to those of my readers who know Latin, that in the expression, "*ecclesiae catholicae matricem et radicem*," the words "*ecclesiae catholicae*" are in the genitive of apposition, so that the whole expression signifies "the womb and root, which is the Catholic Church." See Additional Note 43, p. 466.

that S. Cyprian felt sure in his own mind that S. Cornelius was the legitimate bishop; but he was precluded for the present from openly telling his people to communicate with the party of Cornelius, because, as I have said, the matter was supposed to be in suspense until the return of the two African legates.¹

I will quote one more passage which throws light on S. Cyprian's use of the word "root" (*radix*). In his epistle to Jubaianus S. Cyprian undertakes to prove that the followers of Novatian ought to be rebaptized on their reconciliation with the Church. In the course of his argument he says, "We, who hold fast (*tenemus*) to the fountain-head² and root of the one Church, know assuredly and are confident that to him [Novatian], being outside the Church, nothing is lawful; and that baptism, which is one, is with us, where he also himself was formerly baptized, when he was holding fast (*tenebat*) to both the order and the reality of the divine unity."³ If S. Cyprian had meant to indicate the pope, when he spoke of "the fountain-head and root of the one Church," he would surely have used some such expression as this: "We, the bishops of Africa and Numidia,⁴ who are in communion with the *true* pope of the city, know assuredly that to Novatian, being outside the Church, nothing is lawful." The fact that Novatian claimed to be the legitimate Bishop of Rome would necessitate the insertion of the epithet "true" before the word "pope," or before any periphrasis equivalent to the word "pope," in a clause which gives the ground of S. Cyprian's assurance that Novatian's position was schismatical. That assurance was really grounded on the fact that S. Cyprian and his colleagues were in communion with the Church in her unity and in her historical succession from the apostles, that is with the united episcopate spread throughout the world. It is the universal Church deriving her authority from the apostles and gathered up into her main organ of government, the college of bishops, which is "the fountain-head and root" of true Catholics.⁵

¹ Baronius says that the African bishops had "suspended communication" (*communicationem suspenderant*) both with Cornelius and with Novatian, until the legates' return (*Annal.*, s.a. 254).

² See Additional Note 44, p. 466.

³ "Nos autem, qui ecclesie unius caput et radicem tenemus, pro certo scimus et fidimus nihil illi extra ecclesiam licere, et baptismum, quod est unum, apud nos esse, ubi et ipse baptizatus prius fuerat, quando divinae unitatis et rationem et veritatem tenebat" (*Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaianum*, § 2, *Opp.*, ii. 779).

⁴ See Additional Note 45, p. 467.

⁵ So in his treatise on *The Unity of the Church* (§ 5, *Opp.*, i. 214), in a celebrated passage in which he contrasts the oneness of the whole Church with the multiplicity of the progeny of the Church, S. Cyprian says, "Yet is there one fountain-head, and one source, and one mother prolific in the results of her fruitfulness" (*unum tamen caput est, et origo una, et una mater fecunditatis successibus copiosa*). The argument requires us to interpret these expressions of the Church Catholic in her entirety; but care must be taken to read the treatise in an uninterpolated edition, such as Hartel's. Father Bottalla (*Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 12) has the courage to assert that "unquestionably" these expressions and others like them, occurring in the passage of the *De Unitate*, to which I am referring, denote "the primacy and the authority of S. Peter." In the whole treatise there is not a word about any peculiar authority either in S. Peter or in the Roman see. Peter, as the first-chosen apostle, is historically the first bishop, and so the commencement of the episcopate, and consequently he is a fitting

Moreover, in this particular controversy about rebaptism, S. Cyprian was opposing Pope Stephen.¹ Almost immediately after the letter to Jubaianus was written he must have received an epistle from the pope, threatening him with excommunication, and in the autumn of that same year he actually was excommunicated. It would have been absurd to base his argument in favour of baptizing Novatians on his fellowship with Stephen, who was treating him as a heretic because he baptized Novatians.

These various passages, as it seems to me, throw light on each other. If we compare them together, they are seen to teach the same doctrine. In S. Cyprian's view, the Church Catholic is our mother,² and she who is our mother is also our root,³ and she who is the root, out of which we grow, is also the womb⁴ in which we were conceived by grace, and the fountain-head from which we issue. There is in them no trace of Father Bottalla's idea,⁵ that S. Cyprian held that the Church of Rome is "the centre, the root, the source, and the matrix of Catholic unity."

I have treated at length concerning this Cyprianic phrase, "the matrix and root of the Church." I must try and deal in a more summary way with S. Cyprian's statements about S. Peter. As we might expect, S. Cyprian holds the scriptural and Catholic teaching about S. Peter's

symbol of the unity of the Church. But in the passage, with which we are dealing, S. Cyprian has passed on from the symbol to that which is symbolized, and from the historically first bishop to "the one and undivided episcopate" which governs "the Church" which "is spread abroad;" and it is a perversion of his whole argument to interpret "the sun" and "the tree" and "the fountain" of Peter and of Peter's authority. These expressions set forth the relation of the whole Church in her unity to her separate members, that is to her manifold "progeny," to use S. Cyprian's expression. For proof, I can only refer the reader to the treatise itself, where the meaning is so plain that no comments can make it plainer. See, however, Additional Note 46, p. 467. It is evident that Father Bottalla has been deceived by the interpolations. The words which he quotes in the note are taken from one of them. On these interpolations, see note 3 on p. 87.

¹ See Additional Note 47, p. 469.

² See p. 81.

³ See pp. 83, 84.

⁴ See p. 83.

⁵ It must surely have been through forgetfulness of the state of affairs at Rome during the first few months of the Novatian schism, that Father Bottalla has quoted two passages from S. Cyprian's epistles, as if they proved that S. Cyprian held that "to be in communion with the Bishop of Rome is equivalent to being in communion with the whole Catholic Church." The first passage occurs in the forty-eighth epistle (§ 3, *Opp.*, ii. 607), which was addressed to Pope Cornelius. Owing to the schism in Rome, the African Church was, as we have seen, refraining from addressing letters to either Cornelius or Novatian, until their respective claims should have been fully investigated. When at length the question was cleared up, and it was made evident that Cornelius was the legitimate Catholic bishop, it was agreed that all the African bishops should send letters to Cornelius, "that so," as S. Cyprian says, "all our colleagues might approve of and uphold thee and thy communion—that is, the unity and charity of the Catholic Church." The second passage occurs in the fifty-fifth letter, which is addressed to Antonianus (§ 1, *Opp.*, ii. 624), and is practically to the same effect as the other. To uphold Cornelius and his flock and to reject Novatian and his followers, when once it had been proved that Cornelius was the legitimate bishop, was in fact to support the unity of the Catholic Church as against schism, and the charity of the Catholic Church as against factiousness. The words could have been written concerning the legitimate bishop of any see. They have nothing to do with any special Roman privilege. Such arguments as these of Father Bottalla's seriously damage the cause on behalf of which they are used.

leadership among the apostles, which resulted from the fact that to him first the apostolic office was promised (or given),¹ and showed itself by the initiative which he so largely took in the first founding of the Church. I shall deal with this subject in my third lecture, to which I must refer my readers.² The point, which is characteristic of S. Cyprian, is the stress laid by him on the *symbolical* character which he assigns to S. Peter. That apostle, as *primus inter pares*, is the symbol of the Church Militant;³ just as, according to the teaching of S. Augustine, S. John, the beloved disciple, who reclined on the Lord's bosom at the supper, is the symbol of the Church Triumphant.⁴ This teaching of S. Cyprian about the symbolical character of S. Peter was thoroughly assimilated and reproduced by S. Augustine. Take one passage as a sample. In his 295th sermon, preached on the Feast of S. Peter and S. Paul, S. Augustine says, "Among these [the apostles] almost everywhere it was granted to Peter alone to represent the Church (*gestare personam Ecclesiae*). On account of this character, which he alone bore of representing the whole Church, was it granted him to hear the words, 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' *For these keys not one man, but the unity of the Church received.* Hereby then is the excellence of Peter set forth, that he was an emblem (*figuram gessit*) of the whole body and of the unity of the Church, when it was said to him, 'I give to thee,' what in fact was given to all."⁵ It was not that S. Peter possessed the power of the keys in some supereminent sense. The other apostles possessed that power equally with him. But he, as the first-called apostle, was fitted to symbolize the Church in her unity, so that it should be understood that the power of the keys was given to the unity of the Church—that is, to the united body or society of the Church. This was exactly S. Cyprian's view. I will quote in illustration the opening passage of the argument of S. Cyprian's treatise on the Unity of the Church. S. Cyprian says, "The Lord speaketh unto Peter; 'I say unto thee' (saith He), 'that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.' Upon one he

¹ See note 3 on p. 88.

² See pp. 107–109.

³ Dr. Rivington says (*Authority*, pp. 96, 97), "How could Peter be a symbol of unity, unless he bore a special relationship to the other apostles?" He did bear a special relationship to them. He was the first-called apostle, and so he naturally became the leader of the band; but he was not their ruler or king, and his leadership ended with himself. It was a leadership in founding, and it involved no jurisdiction over the other apostles for himself, nor any jurisdiction over the universal episcopate for his local successors at Rome. S. Peter's precedence in designation was no doubt the reward of his personal faith and loyalty and courage.

⁴ Compare p. 101.

⁵ St. August. *Sermo* ccxcv. cap. 2, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1683, v. 1194. It should be noted that S. Augustine, when he has occasion in another place (*De Bapt.*, lib. lii. cap. xviii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ix. 117) to treat of the commission to remit and retain sins, given to the ten apostles on Easter day, says that they all "*represented the Church*" (*gerabant personam Ecclesiae*).

builds His Church ; and although to all His apostles after His resurrection He gives an equal power,¹ and says, 'As My Father sent Me, even so send I you; receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted to him, and whosoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained;' yet in order to manifest unity, He by His authoritative utterance [to S. Peter] arranged for that same unity a commencement (originem) beginning from one. Certainly the other apostles also were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of honour and power; but the beginning (exordium) starts from unity, that the Church may be set before us as one.² Which one Church in the Song of songs, the Holy Spirit, speaking in the Person of our Lord, designates, and says, 'My dove, My undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her.' He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? He who strives against and resists the Church, is he assured that he is in the Church?"³ Now, I put it to any candid Roman Catholic, Is this the way in which he would write on the great subject of the Church's unity? Perhaps such a one rejoiced when he perceived that S. Cyprian starts his argument with the Petrine text about "*the Rock.*" But the very fact that he begins by quoting that text, makes his subsequent comment on it the more significant. Why, when he is dealing at length with such an important subject as the Church's unity, does he say nothing about that institution which Roman Catholics consider to be the divinely ordained source and guarantee of unity? Why is there nothing about Peter's jurisdiction over the Church? Why is there nothing about the infallible popes, the successors of S. Peter, who are supposed to be the

¹ "Super unum aedificat ecclesiam, et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat," etc.

² "Tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem suâ auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur." It seems to me that the word "auctoritas" in this passage should, according to a well-known use of the word, be taken in a concrete rather than in an abstract sense; but, if any one should think otherwise, my argument will not be affected, as it in no way depends on my suggestion being adopted. The passage quoted in this note is a good illustration of the meaning of another passage, which occurs in the synodal epistle of S. Cyprian's first council on rebaptism. This epistle was no doubt written by S. Cyprian, and is numbered as the seventieth. The council says, "Et baptismum unum sit et Spiritus Sanctus unus et una ecclesia a Christo Domino nostro super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata;" of which passage the sense may be thus expressed, "There is both one baptism, and one Holy Ghost, and one Church founded by Christ the Lord upon Peter, for an origin and (personified) rule of unity" (§ 3, *Opp.*, ii. 769). The ablatives seem to be without construction, and to have a general reference to the sentence.

³ "Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit in ecclesiâ se esse confidit?" (*Opp.*, i. 212, 213). Cardinal de Fleury, the Prime Minister of France under Louis XV., forced the Benedictines to insert the interpolated passages, which had been expunged from every critical edition, and had been erased by Baluze who prepared the edition, which after his death was brought out and fathered by them (see Chiniac de la Bastide Duclaux' *Histoire des Capitulaires des Rois François*, pp. 226-228, ed. 1779). The evidence against the interpolations is overwhelming. For a most ample and interesting account of these interpolations and of their history the reader is referred to Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian, his Life, his Times, his Work*, pp. 200-221, and 544-552.

principle and centre of unity? You may read the whole treatise on Unity from beginning to end, and you will not find one single word about Rome, or about the pope, or about any papal jurisdiction derived from S. Peter.¹ S. Cyprian sees in S. Peter, not the *guarantee* of unity, but, as being the first-designated apostle, the *symbol*, or, to use S. Augustine's word, the *figure (figura)* of unity.² The apostolate was promised, or, as S. Cyprian would perhaps have said, *given*³ to S. Peter first, in order that, a beginning being made from one, unity might be *manifested*, and the Church *be set before us* as one. To a Romanist all this must seem very poor and thin. To an English Catholic it is meat and drink; for it sets forth, both in what is said and in what is not said, the very central truth about the polity of the Church, which he has received to hold. Notice how twice over in this short passage S. Cyprian insists that S. Peter received no peculiar power, that "the other apostles were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of honour and power." Can

¹ See Additional Note 48, p. 469.

² See Additional Note 49, p. 470.

³ It is curious that some of the Fathers seem not to have noticed that our Lord's words to S. Peter, recorded in S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19, convey a *promise*, not a gift. S. Chrysostom (*Hom. liv. in Matt., Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1741, vii. 548) does indeed speak of the words as containing "two promises" (ὑποσχέσεων δύο); but the Fathers speak at times as if the apostolical authority were then and there given. And yet the Lord's words are quite unmistakable: "I will give (δώσω) unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. Later on, the promissive nature of the words was generally acknowledged. Theophylact (tom. vii. p. 647, in *Matt. Hom. lxx. 4*, quoted by Mr. Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, 4th ed., p. 87) acknowledges it very explicitly. In a treatise addressed to Ladislas, King of Poland and Hungary, in 1441, the University of Cracow speaks of our Lord's "verba promissiva, Tu es Petrus, et tibi dabo," etc. (cf. Launoi., lib. i. *ep. x.*, ad *Christoph. Fauvaeum, Opp.*, ed. 1731, tom. v. pars i. p. 105). Baluze, the writer of the notes to the Benedictine S. Cyprian, says (*Opp. S. Cypr. ed. Ben.*, p. 414), speaking of the words *Tibi dabo claves*, "Quamvis istic claves non dentur Petro, sed promittantur," etc. And even Father Bottalla (*Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 30), says, "Although Peter by a prophetic name, and by an explicit promise of an eminent office, had been designated by Christ to be the head and the ruler of His Church, yet Christ, as long as He remained on earth, did not invest him with the high dignity of oecumenical pastor." The Gospel record makes it clear that the apostolate was promised to S. Peter first (S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19); afterwards it was promised to all the twelve (S. Matt. xviii. 18); finally it was conferred on the whole body simultaneously on the evening of the day of our Lord's resurrection (S. John xx. 21-23). This was the actual order of events; but I am inclined to think that S. Cyprian thought that, while all the twelve received precisely the same commission, and were invested with precisely the same oecumenical jurisdiction, S. Peter was actually made an apostle some little time before the others. This, S. Cyprian thinks, was done for symbolical reasons, to show forth the unity of the Church, that the commencement of the Church might start from unity. The symbolism is equally preserved if the truer view be accepted. Unity may be conceived to be set forth by the promise of the apostolical office being made to one first, and later on to the others; while the equality of the apostles is brought out by the simultaneous conferring of the apostolate on Easter day. I might refer, in confirmation of my view of S. Cyprian's meaning, to various passages of his writings. It will perhaps be enough if I call attention to his frequent assertion that the Church was founded *by the voice of the Lord* upon Peter (cf. S. Cyprian. ad *Fortunatum*, § 11, *Opp.*, i. 338; *Ep. xliii. ad plebem universam*, § 5, *Opp.*, ii. 594; *Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaianum*, § 11, *Opp.*, ii. 786). S. Cyprian thinks that our Lord, by his words to S. Peter, actually founded His Church upon that apostle, whereas in fact the words were promissive, not effective.

anything be more frigid, I had almost said senseless, than the Ultramontane reply that S. Cyprian is speaking of the power of order and not of the power of jurisdiction? that the apostles were all equally with S. Peter bishops, but that S. Peter, though no more than a bishop in order, was a bishop of bishops—yea, was the monarch of the Church in jurisdiction? Why does not S. Cyprian say that? The subject of the Church's unity required some treatment of the central jurisdiction. So S. Cyprian felt; but he knew of no more central jurisdiction than the jurisdiction of the apostolic college; and when he passes on to later times, he knows of no more central jurisdiction than "the one and undivided episcopate" (*episcopatum unum atque indivisum*).

When in after-ages the papal idea began to grow up in the Roman Church, it was felt how unsatisfactory from the papal point of view S. Cyprian's teaching was, and a remedy for the supposed mischief was sought. It is generally supposed that Pope Gelasius proscribed his writings, as well he might, for night and day are not in more direct contrast than Gelasius and Cyprian. In a decree ascribed to that pope, lists of books recommended and books proscribed are given, and the works of Thascius Cyprianus occur as an item in the prohibitory index. Afterwards some person or persons unknown forged certain sentences about the grievous consequences of deserting the see of Peter, and inserted them into S. Cyprian's treatise.¹ This just supplied the lacking papal element; and a few lines were enough to give a different turn to the whole argument. Some have supposed that it was after these interpolations had been forged that another clause, irreconcilable with the above-mentioned item, crept into the copies of the Gelasian decree.² According to this other clause, S. Cyprian's writings, instead of being rejected, were placed first on the list of works commended to the faithful for study.³

But let us pass to another Cyprianic passage about S. Peter. In his thirty-third epistle, which is addressed to the lapsed, S. Cyprian writes as follows: "Our Lord, whose precepts we ought to reverence and observe, *determining the honour of a bishop* and the ordering (*rationem*) of His Church, speaks in the Gospel, and says to Peter, 'I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' Thence the ordination of bishops and the ordering (*ratio*) of the Church runs down through the changes of times and successions, *so that the Church is settled upon the bishops*, and every act

¹ Ultramontane writers suggest that the interpolations were marginal notes, which crept into the text by the carelessness of copyists. With every wish to be charitable, I feel no doubt myself that the forgery was deliberate. Anyhow, whether forged or not, they very conveniently got into the text, and entirely changed the impression produced by the whole argument.

² It may be worth noticing that the *Church History* of Eusebius is placed both among the prohibited books and also among the commended books (see Hefele, iv. 46, E. tr.).

³ The decree, with its two irreconcilable clauses, is given in Coleti (v. 387, 390).

of the Church is controlled by these same rulers."¹ Notice, again, how the great Petrine passage suggests to S. Cyprian, as it suggests to us, not the government of the Church by popes, but the government of the Church by bishops.² S. Peter was not the pope over the apostles, but one among them; the first called,³ and therefore the natural leader and spokesman and representative, but with no larger jurisdiction than the others. What he was, they all were, namely, founders and foundations and rulers of the Church of God. Their successors in their ruling office, and therefore his successors, were the bishops. S. Peter might or might not have special diocesan successors in particular sees, such as Antioch or Rome. S. Cyprian says nothing here about such local successions. Even if there were such local successions, they would be, from S. Cyprian's point of view, accidental, not essential or vital. The vital point was and is that the bishops everywhere inherit the whole ordinary jurisdiction of the apostolic college. They are all the successors of the apostles, and as of the others, so specially of the representative apostle, Peter. "The Church is settled upon the bishops." This is good Catholic teaching, which it has been the glory of the English Church to treasure up, and hand down, and consolidate, as the basis of her whole system of polity. We are grateful to the Latin communion for some precious things, which she has guarded more faithfully than we have guarded them; but in regard to other matters, and specially in regard to the divinely ordered constitution of the Church, it is for her to learn from us.

I think that the teaching of S. Cyprian about the relation of S. Peter to the Church's unity and to the episcopate, which I have gathered from these two passages, will suggest the true interpretation of several other passages in the holy martyr's writings, and will make it unnecessary for me to treat them at length. I subjoin them to this appendix in an *Addendum*,⁴ so that the reader may be in possession of all the Cyprianic passages which have been quoted in favour of the papal theory.

I have now fulfilled my promise⁵ to deal with the various passages from the Cyprianic documents which are quoted by Father Bottalla in support of his notion that S. Cyprian acknowledges "the closest connexion between the unity of the Church, as represented by Christ, and the headship of one universal pastor." I confidently assert that the meaning of each one of the quoted passages has been misrepresented by Father

¹ Ep. xxxiii. *ad Lapsos, Opp.*, ii. 566.

² See Additional Note 50, p. 471.

³ The author of the article "*Pope*," in the *Catholic Dictionary* by Messrs. Addis and Arnold (p. 671), says very strangely, "Peter, of course, was not chosen first in order of time." One can only suppose that the writer has confused the calling of S. Peter to be a *disciple*, as recorded in S. John i. 41, 42, with his calling to be an *apostle*, as recorded in S. Matt. x. 1, 2. As we have already seen, S. Cyprian held that S. Peter was not only called first, but that he was also consecrated first. This notion is doubtless based on a mistake, but it ought to be kept in mind, if we would understand S. Cyprian aright (see note 3 on p. 88).

⁴ See pp. 91-95.

⁵ I have dealt with the passage, in which S. Cyprian calls the see and church at Rome the *cathedra Petri et ecclesia principalis*, in my second lecture (see pp. 51, 52).

Bottalla. I of course exonerate him from any intentional deceit; but the fact remains that the meaning of the passages has been misrepresented. I do not believe that the idea of a "headship of one universal pastor" over the whole Church ever entered S. Cyprian's mind, as a thing either to be accepted or rejected.¹ His whole notion of the Church presupposed a college of essentially co-equal bishops owning no divinely appointed personal superior, excepting only our Lord Jesus Christ. In one sense this appendix does injustice to S. Cyprian. The necessity of disproving Father Bottalla's statements has compelled me to dwell on those few sentences in the Cyprianic documents, which might conceivably be twisted into a papal meaning. I hope that I have successfully untwisted them. But S. Cyprian's whole view must be gathered, not from those few passages, but from his writings at large, and still more from his actions. S. Cyprian was the most glorious saint and the most illustrious Church-ruler of his age. The whole Church has venerated him with special honour ever since his martyrdom: we know more about him than about any other post-apostolic saint of the first three centuries: the circumstances of his life led him to deal specially with matters connected with the government of the Church: and both his writings and the story of his life remain as a perpetual witness against the papal, and in favour of the episcopal, constitution of the Church of God.

Addendum to Appendix B.

In this *Addendum* I propose to collect such passages from S. Cyprian's writings as have been or might be quoted in favour of the papal theory, and have not been discussed either in the second lecture or in Appendix B. It will not be necessary for me to comment on them at any length, because I trust that what I have written on pp. 85-90 will enable the reader to perceive at once S. Cyprian's meaning.

1. In his Epistle to Quintus, S. Cyprian says, "For neither did Peter, whom the Lord chose first, and on whom He built His Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him about circumcision, claim anything to himself insolently, nor arrogantly assume anything; so as to say that he held the primacy, and that he ought rather to be obeyed by novices and those lately come; nor did he despise Paul because he had previously been a persecutor of the Church, but he admitted the counsel of truth, and readily yielded to the legitimate argument which Paul pressed; furnishing thereby a lesson to us both of concord and patience, that we should not obstinately love our own opinions, but should rather adopt as our own those which at any time are usefully and wholesomely suggested by our brethren and colleagues, if they be true and lawful."² According

¹ Compare Archbishop Benson's words quoted in note 5 on p. 66. If any one supposes that S. Cyprian was conscious of a claim made on the part of Pope Stephen to be the "universal pastor" of the Church, then it will follow that the saint deliberately rejected the papal idea (see the passage quoted on p. 65). Either way his witness is diametrically opposed to the Ultramontane theory set forth in the Vatican decrees.

² "Nam nec Petrus, quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem aedificavit

to S. Cyprian's view, which has been discussed in note 3 on p. 88, the apostolate was given to S. Peter before it was given to the other apostles, and to him it was given, when the Lord said to him, "On this rock I will build My Church." S. Peter had no greater powers than the other apostles, but his seniority by consecration made him the symbol of the Church's unity. S. Cyprian holds that for a short time he was the only foundation, the other apostles not having received their powers until some time had elapsed; and so, on this view, the Church may be said to have been built on S. Peter in a certain pre-eminent way. This is the meaning of the "*super quem aedificavit ecclesiam suam.*" When S. Peter and S. Paul are compared as regards their apostolic office, there is no question that the former had a priority both in time and order. But S. Cyprian points out that, if in consequence of this priority S. Peter had expected S. Paul to obey him, he would have been guilty of insolence and arrogance. In other words, S. Peter had no primacy of jurisdiction, S. Paul was his "brother and colleague."

2. In his epistle to Jubaianus, S. Cyprian says, "To Peter, in the first place, upon whom He built the Church, and from whom He appointed and shewed forth the origin of the unity, the Lord gave that power, namely, that whatsoever he should loose should be loosed [on earth]."¹ The comment on the previous passage applies also to the first clause of this one. The appointment and manifestation of the origin of unity through S. Peter's priority of consecration is illustrated by the passage from the *De Unitate*, quoted and discussed on pp. 86-89.²

3. In one of his epistles to S. Cornelius, S. Cyprian says,³ "Peter, however, on whom the Church has been built by the same Lord, one speaking for all, and answering in the voice of the Church, says, 'Lord, to whom shall we go?'" After what has been said previously, there is no need to make any comment here.

4. In an earlier part of the same letter, S. Cyprian had said, "For ecclesiam suam, . . . vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter aut roganter adsumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi potius oportere . . . quae aliquando a fratribus et collegis nostris utiliter et salubriter suggeruntur . . ." (*Ep.* lxxi. *ad Quintum*, § 3, *Opp.*, ii. 773).

¹ "Nam Petro primum Dominus, supra quem aedificavit ecclesiam, et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit ut id solveretur [in terris] quod ille solvisset" (*Ep.* lxxiii. *ad Jubaianum*, § 7, *Opp.*, ii. 783). The conclusion, which S. Cyprian draws from this premiss, is not that the pope is the monarch of the Church or its necessary centre of unity, but that "they only, who are set over the Church, and are appointed by the law of the gospel and the ordinance of the Lord, may lawfully baptize and give remission of sins, . . . and that no one can usurp to himself, against bishops and priests, what is not in his own right and power." As usual, S. Cyprian sees in the promise of our Lord to S. Peter the institution of the episcopate.

² See also the Additional Note 49, p. 470. I have already pointed out (see p. 85) the very strained relations which existed between S. Cyprian and Pope Stephen when this letter was written. S. Cyprian was on the verge of being excommunicated by Rome, and would certainly not insert passages at such a time in support of the necessity of union with Rome.

³ "Petrus tamen super quem aedificata ab eodem Domino fuerat ecclesia unus pro omnibus loquens et ecclesiae voce respondens ait: 'Domine ad quem imus'" (*Ep.* lix. *ad Cornelium*, § 7, *Opp.*, ii. 674).

this has been the very source whence heresies and schisms have taken their rise, when obedience is not paid to God's bishop (sacerdoti), nor do they reflect that there is for the time one bishop (sacerdos) in a church [*i.e.* in each church], and one judge for the time in Christ's stead; whom if the whole brotherhood would obey, according to the divine injunctions, no one would stir in anything against the college of bishops (sacerdotum)."¹ It need hardly be said that in S. Cyprian's writings, as in the writings of many of the other Fathers, the word "*sacerdos*" almost always means *bishop*, and hardly ever *presbyter*. I should not have loaded my pages with this passage if I had not noticed that it is quoted by some Ultramontane writers as if it proved that the pope is the "one judge," who judges the whole Church "in Christ's stead." The wording of the passage and the whole argument of the epistle show that S. Cyprian is speaking of the functions of each bishop in his own church, and not of any supposed ecumenical functions of the pope in regard to the Church universal.

5. In his epistle to Florentius Puppianus, S. Cyprian says, "There (S. John vi. 67-69) speaks Peter, upon whom the Church was to be built; teaching and showing in the name of the Church that, although a contumacious and proud multitude of such as will not obey may withdraw, yet the Church does not depart from Christ, and they are the Church who are a people united to the bishop (sacerdoti), and a flock adhering to their own pastor."² The words about S. Peter will be understood from previous explanations. The definition of the Church at the end of the passage contains no allusion to the pope. It speaks of the flock in each diocese adhering to their own bishop.

6. In the treatise *De Bono Patientiae*, S. Cyprian says,³ "Peter likewise, on whom the Church was founded by the good pleasure of the Lord, lays it down in his Epistle." Comment is needless.

7. In an epistle addressed to his Carthaginian flock, S. Cyprian says,⁴ "There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one chair founded by the word of the Lord on Peter (super Petrum)."⁵ Another

¹ "Neque enim aliunde haereses abortae sunt aut nata sunt schismata quam quando sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesiâ ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus iudex vice Christi cogitatur . . ." (§ 5, *Opp.*, ii. 671, 672). I will insert here a few references to passages, in which bishops are styled "Vicars of Christ," or "Vicars of the Lord." Ambrosiaster says that a bishop "vicarius Domini est" (in 1 *Cor.* xi. 10, ap. S. Ambros. *Opp.*, P. L., xvii. 253, 254). Pope Hormisdas, in a letter to the bishops of Spain, describes bishops as "Vicars of Christ" (Coleti, v. 604). The same expression is used of bishops by the Synod of Compiègne in the year 833, by that of Thionville in 844, and by that of Meaux in 845 (Coleti, ix. 801, 942, 961). See also S. Thom. *Summ. Theol.*, p. iii. q. lxiv. art. ii. ad 3^m.

² "Loquitur illic Petrus, super quem aedificanda fuerat ecclesia . . . et illi sunt ecclesia, plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori suo grex adhaerens" (*Ep.* lxxi. ad Florentium Puppianum, § 8, *Opp.*, ii. 732, 733).

³ "Item Petrus, super quem ecclesia Domini dignatione fundata est, in epistola sua ponit" (*De Bon. Pat.*, § 9, *Opp.*, i. 403).

⁴ "Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum (*al.* petram) Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui aut sacerdotium novum fieri praeter unum altare et unum sacerdotium non potest" (*Ep.* xliii. ad plebem, § 5, *Opp.*, ii. 594).

⁵ Some manuscripts read "super petram," "on the rock." The sense would

altar cannot be set up, nor a new priesthood made, besides the one altar and the one priesthood." S. Cyprian is warning his people against the schism of Felicissimus, who had set up a separate altar at Carthage and had got five Carthaginian priests to join him. S. Cyprian explains that in each local church there is but one episcopal chair; one priesthood—that is, the one true bishop and the clergy adhering to him; and one altar. The "one chair"—that is, the episcopate of the one canonical bishop—is founded on Peter, for according to S. Cyprian and the Fathers generally all legitimate bishops are the successors of Peter.¹ In the words "the one chair" there is not the most remote allusion to the episcopal chair of the bishops of Rome. The see of Rome was at that time vacant, and there had been as yet no Roman condemnation of the Carthaginian schismatics. It was against Cyprian that they were rebelling, and it is his own chair of which he is speaking.² Any Carthaginian Christian who separates himself from the one Bishop of Carthage "remains without the Church." It is to me most astounding that Dr. Rivington should have quoted the passage about "the chair," as if it referred to "the Church of the Romans."³

I have now gone through the whole of my collection of Cyprianic passages, which have been quoted by Ultramontanes in proof of their idea that S. Cyprian held the papal theory. I have not intentionally withheld any passage, though of course it may easily happen that I may have failed to notice one or more. I feel morally sure that I have quoted all those on which stress is usually laid. I submit very confidently my case to the candid reader. I do not believe that in any one of these passages there is the smallest ground for supposing that S. Cyprian intended to teach papalism. If this is all that Ultramontanes can discover in his writings, which may seem to favour their cause, they had much better say nothing about him. His real view of the authority of the Bishops of Rome is set forth in numerous passages of his letters and treatises, and above all by his acts. Fully to discuss those

be the same. I follow Hartel in the text. The Benedictines read "petram." I will add here references to two other passages in which S. Cyprian speaks of the Church being founded on S. Peter "by the word of the Lord." He says in *Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaianum*, § 11 (*Opp.*, ii. 786), "Ad ecclesiam, quae una est et super unum, qui et claves ejus accepit, Domini voce fundata est." And again he says in his treatise, *Ad Fortunatum*, § 11 (*P. L.*, iv. 694, 695), "Cum septem liberis plane copulatur et mater origo et radix, quae ecclesias septem postmodum peperit, ipsa prima et una super Petrum Domini voce fundata." On the reading "Petrum" in this passage, see p. 464, note 1.

¹ See the passage from S. Cyprian, which I have quoted and discussed on pp. 89, 90. Compare also a passage from S. Chrysostom quoted on p. 123, and see S. Greg. Nyss., *De Castigal.*, *Patrol. Graec.*, xlvi. 312, and Bossuet, *Def. Cler. Gall.*, lib. viii. capp. 12, 13, *Opp.*, ed. 1817, xxxii. 602-611. According to the Fathers, the bishops are all successors of the apostles, and therefore of S. Peter, the representative apostle.

² Sometimes the Fathers describe "the one episcopate" as the apostolic chair; so S. Basil in his 197th epistle (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 288) congratulates S. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, on his elevation to the episcopate, and he says, "The Lord Himself translated you from among the judges of the earth to the chair of the apostles" (*ἐπὶ τῆν καθέδραν τῶν ἀποστόλων*).

³ *Authority*, p. 99.

passages and those acts would require a volume. I have given a short account of some of them in my second lecture¹ and in Appendix A.² The defenders of the English Church may safely stake their case, so far as it relates to the papal claims, on the witness borne by S. Cyprian. May the prayers of that blessed martyr draw down upon the Church of England and upon us her children a full measure of the divine blessing and protection !

¹ See pp. 49-72.

² See pp. 72-77.

LECTURE III.

THE RELATION OF S. PETER TO THE APOSTOLIC COLLEGE AND TO THE CHURCH.

IN my two previous lectures I adduced various historical facts and various passages from the writings of the Fathers, which seemed to me to prove that the view of the papal authority laid down in the Vatican decrees was not accepted by the Church during the first three centuries of our era. The conditions, under which these lectures are given, prevent my attempting any exhaustive treatment of the question ; but I have not consciously kept back any facts or passages belonging to those centuries, which would in my opinion avail to rebut or qualify the general conclusion at which we arrived.¹ I believe that that conclusion is in complete agreement with the truth. The Church at large, during the ages of persecution, did not recognize in the Roman see any primacy of jurisdiction outside Italy, and still less did it recognize in that see any gift of infallibility.

We may, therefore, enter on the consideration of the scriptural evidence with the expectation of finding that the papal claims find no solid support in the Bible. It would be strange, indeed, if the New Testament pointed plainly to the pope as the infallible monarch of the Church, and yet that the great saints and martyrs of the first three centuries should ignore such a fundamentally important principle of Church polity. Such an argument might be inapplicable, if we were dealing with some very abstract question of theology. But if a great body like the Church had been subjected by its Divine Founder to an infallible king, it could hardly exist for three centuries without there being very evident proofs that

¹ A friend has suggested that it would be well that I should refer to the genuine epistle of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthian Church, in which he, suppressing his own name, and writing in the name of his church, uses an urgent tone in remonstrating with the Corinthian Christians on the subject of their impious rebellion against their duly appointed presbyters. I can see no expression in that epistle in any way implying a claim on the part of S. Clement to exercise jurisdiction as pope over the Corinthian Church. As Dr. Salmon observes (*Infallibility*, p. 379, 2nd edit.), the tone "is only that of the loving remonstrance which any Christian is justified in offering to an erring brother." The reader is referred to Dr. Salmon's treatment of the whole subject of this remonstrance (*Infallibility*, pp. 377-379, 2nd edit.). See also Additional Note 51, p. 471.

the rule of such infallible king was one of the chief factors in its life. Government is not an abstract theory, but a practical fact.

Let us, however, approach the study of the scriptural evidence in a teachable and dispassionate spirit, desiring to perceive, and having perceived to accept, whatever our Lord and His apostles intended to teach.

I suppose that all will agree that, if the doctrine of the papal monarchy is taught anywhere in Holy Scripture, it is taught in the promise made by our Lord to S. Peter at Caesarea Philippi, as we find that promise recorded in S. Matt. xvi. 17-19. The Vatican decree quotes this passage and also the passage in the last chapter of S. John's Gospel, in which our Lord is recorded to have said to S. Peter, "Feed My lambs," "Feed My sheep," and it deduces, from what it calls "this plain teaching of Holy Scripture," the conclusion that "a primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God was promised and given immediately and directly to blessed Peter the apostle by Christ the Lord." Following the guidance of the council, let us proceed to consider the first of these two passages,¹ which, if I am not mistaken, is allowed by every one to be the fundamental passage.

It will be well, I think, to quote the whole passage together with the verses which immediately precede it; and I will read them first of all as they stand in the Revised Version. S. Matthew says, "Now when Jesus came into the parts of Caesarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying, Who do men say that the Son of man is? And they said, Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah: and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The Authorized Version and the Douay Version have "the gates of hell" instead of "the gates of hades;" but of course those two expressions, as used here, are identical in meaning, and in other respects the Authorized Version and the Douay Version agree substantially with the

¹ The other passage, contained in S. John xxi. 15-17, is discussed in Appendix C, pp. 117-128.

Revised Version in their translation of the promise to S. Peter. The question before us is, What does that promise mean? If the view taken by the Vatican Council is correct, we have here the creation, or at any rate the promise of the creation, of a permanent institution of the most transcendently important kind. Christ is creating, or at any rate is promising to create, an office, the holder of which shall be His sole vicar and representative in the supreme government of His Church. Dr. Murray of Maynooth, referring to this passage, says that "Peter was thus established by our Lord as the means of imparting to the Church indefectibility and unity, and of permanently securing these properties to her. Peter was invested with supreme spiritual authority to legislate for the whole Church; to teach, to inspect, to judge, to proscribe erroneous doctrine, or whatever would tend to the destruction of the Church; to appoint to offices or remove therefrom, or limit or extend the jurisdiction thereof, as the safety or welfare of the Church would require: in one word, to exercise as supreme head, and ruler, and teacher, and pastor all spiritual functions whatever that are necessary for the well-being or existence of the Church."¹ This is how a learned professor at Maynooth describes the office which he considers to have been promised to S. Peter by the words recorded in S. Matthew, and afterwards to have been conferred on *him*, and from time to time, as occasion has arisen, to have been conferred also on his successors in the see of Rome. Now, if this really was our Lord's meaning, this passage is a passage of the most tremendous importance. On that hypothesis, one could not but agree with Cardinal Bellarmine when he first puts the question,² "What are we dealing with, when we deal with the papal primacy?" and then proceeds to answer his own question thus: "We are dealing with the principal matter of Christianity" (*de summa rei Christianæ*). Similarly the Jesuit Perrone says, "When we are treating about the head of the Church, we are treating about the principal point of the matter on which the existence and safety of the Church herself altogether depends."³ Similarly, M. de Maistre says, "The sovereign pontiff is the necessary, only, and exclusive foundation of Christianity. To him belong the promises, with him disappears unity, that is the Church;" and again, "The supremacy of the pope is the capital dogma without which Christianity cannot subsist."⁴ I say once more, If our

¹ Quoted from the *Irish Annual Miscellany*, iii. 300, by Dr. Salmon (*Infallibility of the Church*, 2nd edit., p. 333).

² Quoted by Perrone, *Praelect. Theoll.*, edit. 1841, tom. ii. pars i. p. 308, n.

³ Perrone, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Du Pape, Discours Prelim.*, i. 13, and iv. 5, quoted by Allies, *Church of England cleared from Schism*, 2nd edit., p. 358, n.

Lord, by His promise to S. Peter, meant to declare that He would create a permanent representative of Himself to be the infallible monarch of His Church on earth, as the Vatican Council teaches, then I think that we should all agree with Bellarmine, Perrone, and De Maistre, and we should hold that in this passage of S. Matthew we have delivered to us a dogma of the most fundamental character. Surely, therefore, if this view be the true view, when we come to examine the comments of the holy Fathers on this passage, we shall find them unanimously agreeing in the interpretation which they give. Even if they differed about some minor points, yet they will be in complete accord as to the substance. But when we proceed to investigate the comments of the Fathers, we do not find that unanimity which on the Romanist hypothesis would have been anticipated. The Fathers are by no means agreed in holding that the rock was S. Peter himself. It is true that that is decidedly the more common opinion and the oldest; but, nevertheless, some hold that the rock is Christ, and others that it is the doctrine of our Lord's Godhead, which S. Peter had confessed when he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."¹

But any candid Roman Catholic who looks carefully into the matter will be astonished when he examines those passages in which the "rock" is interpreted of S. Peter himself. He will be amazed to find that hardly any of them connect the building of the Church on S. Peter with any successors to S. Peter in the see of Rome. It is true that a fair number of such passages might probably be found in the writings of the popes or of papal legates and other similar officials, from the time of Pope Damasus (*circa* A.D. 370) onwards.² But, apart

¹ In the Liturgy of S. James, at the point in the service where the consecration of the Gifts has just been consummated by the Epiklesis, the priest prays that the Body and Blood of our Lord "may be to those who communicate of them, for remission of sins and for life everlasting, . . . for the strengthening of Thy holy Catholic Church, *which Thou didst found upon the rock of the faith*, that the gates of Hades should not prevail against it." These words occur both in the Greek and in the Syriac forms of the Liturgy, and therefore belong to its more ancient portion (see Hammond's *Ancient Liturgies*, pp. 43, 72). In the Roman Missal, the collect for the Vigil of S. Peter and S. Paul runs as follows: "Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that we whom Thou hast established *on the rock of the apostolic confession* (*quos in apostolicæ confessionis petra solidasti*) may be shaken by no disturbances." I quote these two liturgical interpretations of "the rock," partly because of their great interest, and partly because I have not noticed them in the ordinary catenas illustrating the patristic interpretation of our Lord's promise to S. Peter.

² Quotations from such sources will not count for much in a controversy of this kind. Our contention is that the idea of a divinely appointed supremacy over the whole Church, as a prerogative of the Roman see, arose very largely out of the exorbitant claims made by the popes. It follows that exaggerated claims in favour of the papacy, when they occur in the writings of the popes or of other persons living, so to speak, in a papal atmosphere, and when they stand in marked contrast with the general teaching of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church,

from the popes and their *entourage*, I only know of two such passages anterior to the age of S. Leo (*circa* A.D. 450). One of these occurs in a certain letter written by S. Jerome, while he was still a layman, and before he was thirty years old, about which letter I hope to be able to say something in my next lecture;¹ and the other occurs in a popular controversial ballad written by S. Augustine for the benefit of the Donatists in the early portion of his ecclesiastical career, about two years after he had been ordained priest. In that ballad, the argument of which appears to be mainly taken from the writings of S. Optatus of Mileum,² S. Augustine says, "Number the bishops even *from* the very seat of Peter, and see every succession in that line of Fathers: that [seat] is the rock against which the proud gates of hell prevail not."³ At first sight S. Augustine, in this passage, appears to identify the Roman see with the "rock." But it is worthy of notice that S. Augustine does not say, "Number the bishops *in* the very see of Peter," but "Number them even *from* the very seat of Peter." The "seat of Peter" seems to be the *starting-point* of the succession, not the succession itself; and, if so, it would have to be understood as equivalent to the apostolate of Peter (cf. S. Aug., *Contr. Epist. Manich.*, cap. iv., *Opp.*, viii. 153, where there is a very similar passage);⁴ so that the "rock" would be, not the long succession of Roman bishops, but S. Peter in his apostolical office, and in his primacy of order among the apostles, in consequence of which, as S. Augustine would add, he was the symbol of the whole Church. If this was what S. Augustine meant, the passage in the anti-Donatist ballad will fall into line with a few passages in other early writings of his. Otherwise it stands alone. On this interpretation S. Augustine's argument may be thus paraphrased: You Donatists are a comparatively new body; we Catholics can trace up the succession of our bishops to the very apostles themselves; and in particular in the great apostolical see of the West we can give the whole line of names reaching up to the primate apostle, the rock of the Church. This is exactly

cannot be quoted, at any rate controversially, on the papal side. *We* regard them as the proofs of papal ambition. In connexion with this subject, it is surely permissible to refer in all reverence to our Lord's own words, "If I bear witness of Myself, My witness is not true" (S. John v. 31).

¹ See pp. 160-166.

² Tillemont, xiii. 197.

³ S. Aug., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1688, ix. 8—

"Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede,
Et in ordine illo patrum quis cui succedit videte:
Ipsa est petra, quam non vincunt superbae inferorum portae."

⁴ See also Additional Note 52, p. 472.

the argument which S. Augustine does use in his epistle to Generosus (*Ep.* liii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1688, ii. 120, 121). In that case there was a special reason for dwelling on the succession of names reaching up to the apostles, because the Donatist priest, to whom the saint is replying, had been boasting to Generosus of the succession of Donatist bishops in the Donatist see of Cirta. But S. Augustine, while tracing the line of Roman bishops up to S. Peter, avoids any identification of them with the "rock." S. Peter, he says, was called the "rock" because he symbolized "the whole Church." For reasons, which I have already explained, the notion of S. Peter having been the first local Bishop of Rome is, in my opinion, the direct or indirect outcome of the Clementine romance.

It will be inferred from these remarks that I do not myself think that in his ballad S. Augustine intended to identify the Roman see with the "rock;" but let us give our opponents the benefit of the doubt, if there be a doubt. Then I say, Is it not very remarkable that S. Augustine, who in his later life wrote many anti-Donatist treatises, never once recurs to this argument, and never once brings in the idea of S. Peter's successors in the see of Rome as included in the rock? S. Augustine often refers to our Lord's promise to S. Peter. In his earlier writings he occasionally interprets¹ the "rock" as meaning S. Peter; and, following S. Cyprian, he thinks that S. Peter, as the leading apostle, was the representative and symbol of the whole Church Militant, just as he also thinks that S. John² was the symbol of the whole Church Triumphant. But in his later writings he always takes the view that the "rock" was Christ, *and not S. Peter*, though he still continues to hold that S. Peter is the symbol of the Church. It is important to notice that according to this later view S. Augustine not only affirms that the "rock" meant our Lord, but he at the same time denies that it meant S. Peter. This precludes the notion that he was suggesting a secondary meaning, which might be accepted as true, side by side with the primary meaning. The later interpretation excludes the earlier. I will quote one example of this later method of interpretation. S. Augustine, in a sermon on our Lord walking on the water, and on S. Peter sinking, says, "The gospel just read . . . teaches us to consider . . . the Apostle Peter as the type of the one only Church. For this Peter, first in the order of

¹ *In Psalm. xxx. Enarr.*, iii. § 5 (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1691, iv. 156); *In Psalm. lxxix.* § 4 (iv. 714).

² *In Johann. Evang.* cap. 21, *Tractat.* cxxiv. (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1690, tom. iii. pars 2, coll. 822-824).

the apostles, most ready in the love of Christ, often answers singly for all. He it was, at the question of the Lord Jesus Christ as to who men said that He was, when the disciples gave in answer the various opinions of men, and the Lord again inquired and said, 'But who say ye that I am?'—Peter it was who answered, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' One for many he gave the answer, being the oneness in the many.¹ Then the Lord said unto him, 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven.' Then He added, 'And I also say unto thee'—as if He would say, 'Because thou hast said unto Me, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'—'I also say unto thee, Thou art Peter.' Simon he was called before; but this name of Peter was given him by the Lord, and that in figure to signify the Church. For because Christ is the Rock (*Petra*), Peter (*Petrus*) is the Christian people. For the Rock (*Petra*) is the mother-word or root-word (*Petra enim principale nomen est*).² Therefore Peter (*Petrus*) is from *Petra*, not *Petra* from *Petrus*: as Christ is not called from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. 'Thou art, therefore,' saith He, 'Peter; and upon this Rock which thou hast confessed, upon this Rock which thou hast recognized, saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," I will build My Church. Upon Me I will build thee, not Me upon thee.'"³ S. Augustine, at the end of his career, when he was seventy-four years old, wrote his two books of *Retractations*, and in the first of them he calls attention to the fact that in his later writings he had given an interpretation of the "Rock" differing from that which he had given in his earlier years. The passage is interesting, and is very pertinent to our subject, so I will quote it. S. Augustine says, "While I was still a presbyter, I wrote a book against the Epistle of Donatus,⁴ . . . in which

¹ "Unitas in multis;" that means, I suppose, that S. Peter as leader had a certain uniqueness of position among the many apostles, which qualified him to be the fitting spokesman for the rest; or perhaps it may more probably mean that S. Peter, being one apostle, gave the answer on behalf of the many apostles, because he symbolized the unity of the Church, which is made up of many members. The great terseness of S. Augustine's phrase makes it difficult to say with certainty what his meaning was; but one test of a true interpretation must be its harmony with the saint's general line of teaching in regard to S. Peter's position. See Additional Note 53, p. 472.

² Notice the word *principale* as used here. It illustrates the meaning of a passage from S. Cyprian, which I discussed in my second lecture (see p. 51).

³ *Serm. lxxvi. de verbis. Evang. Matth. 14, Opp.*, ed. Ben. 1683, v. 415. The teaching of this homily was very familiar to our forefathers in the Middle Ages. From it are taken the 7th, 8th, and 9th lessons at Mattins on the Feast of S. Peter's chains (August 1), in the Sarum Breviary (*Brev. Sar.*, fasc. iii. coll. 572-574, ed. Cantab. 1886).

⁴ The book is, unfortunately, not extant.

I said, in a certain place concerning the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded on him as on a rock: which meaning is also sung by the mouth of many in the verses of the most blessed Ambrose, where he says of the cock—

‘Repentance once the crowing cock
Brought to the Church’s promised rock.’¹

But I know that I have afterwards in very many places so expounded the Lord’s saying, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,’ as to be understood of Him whom Peter confessed, when he said, ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.’ And so Peter, named from this Rock (viz. Christ), would typify the person of the Church, which is built upon this Rock, and hath received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him, ‘Thou art the Rock’ (*Petra*), but ‘Thou art Peter’ (*Petrus*). But Christ was the Rock, whom Simon confessing, as the whole Church confesses Him, was called Peter. But of these two meanings let the reader choose the more probable.”² There can be no question which of these two S. Augustine thought the more probable, when he wrote his books of *Retractations*, and, in fact, during the whole of the latter part of his life. But the important point for us to notice is the fact that S. Augustine appears to be completely unconscious that he is dealing with a dogmatic passage of high importance. In his early days as a priest he put forth a view which might perhaps be twisted into some likeness to the Ultramontane interpretation which now prevails in the Roman communion; not that S. Augustine had ever really conceived of the Ultramontane theory in its entirety; but still, so far as words go, he wrote three lines in his anti-Donatist ballad which Ultramontanes are very glad to quote. As far as we know, in all his voluminous writings he never again, even in appearance, identified the “rock” with the Roman see. Two or three

¹ S. Ambrose’s hymn is, in most Western breviaries, appointed to be sung at Lauds on Sundays after Epiphany and on the three Sundays which precede Lent. In some breviaries it is also appointed to be used on the Sundays after Trinity.

² *Retract.*, lib. i. cap. xxi., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1689, i. 32. It should be noticed that S. Augustine does not say, “The reader should accept both of these meanings, the one as the primary, the other as the secondary interpretation; especially he should be careful to hold in any case that the ‘rock’ means S. Peter, because on that interpretation mainly depends the scriptural proof of ‘the principal matter of Christianity.’” But he says, “Let the reader choose the more probable.” In S. Augustine’s view the two meanings are mutually exclusive. As during the whole of S. Augustine’s later life he adhered to the view that the “rock” means Christ, it must be said that he gave up his earlier view that the “rock” means Peter. He did implicitly “retract” and “contradict” and “withdraw” what he had said in his anti-Donatist ballad; although he certainly never intended to express in that ballad the modern papal theory. I make these remarks in reply to Dr. Rivington’s words in *Authority*, p. 33.

times—I hardly think more—he identified the “rock” with S. Peter. Afterwards he almost always explains the “rock” as meaning Christ. He could not possibly have changed his view on any matter of dogmatic importance without explaining the *rationale* of his change. If he did it nowhere else, he would have done it in his *Retractations*. The fact that he made the change without making any such explanation, shows conclusively that in his opinion no important dogma depends for its scriptural proof on our Lord’s promise to S. Peter; and he therefore certainly did not hold the view of the Vatican Council, that in that promise of our Lord the Holy Scripture plainly teaches us that Christ promised to S. Peter a primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church, and that that primacy, by Christ’s appointment, was to be perpetuated in S. Peter’s successors in the Roman see.¹ Even if, for the sake of argument, we granted that he held that view when he was a newly ordained priest, it is quite certain that he must have given it up after he had become a bishop. We may, therefore, set aside the lines from the ballad. Understood as Roman Catholic controversialists profess to understand them, they do not really represent S. Augustine’s mature teaching.

As I have already observed, if we except the popes and their belongings from the time of Damasus onwards, the other Fathers, before the time of S. Leo, who interpret the “rock” of S. Peter, in no way connect the passage with the successors of the two great apostles in the Roman see. Some, like Tertullian,² think that the promise was fulfilled by S. Peter’s having taken the lead in founding the Church on the day of Pentecost. Others, like S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian, hold that all bishops inherit the promise made to S. Peter, and that therefore the Church is founded on the bishops. The one view about which, outside Rome and its surroundings, there seems to be a conspiracy of silence among the Fathers anterior to S. Leo, is the view set forth by the Vatican Council. Such a conspiracy of silence is simply inconceivable, if the Vatican teaching truly expresses the doctrine originally delivered to the Church by the apostles. It is what we should naturally expect to find if the Vatican teaching is “a fond thing vainly invented,” and foisted into the Church at a later date by ambition and ignorance.

I hope that I have made it clear that there is no one authoritative tradition in regard to the true interpretation of the promise to S. Peter. One might, indeed, fairly say that

¹ The council anathematizes all who deny that “ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione” S. Peter is to have a perpetual line of successors in his primacy, and that the Roman pontiff is such successor.

² Cf. Tertull., *De Pudicit.*, xxi.

there is a *consensus patrum* excluding the Vatican interpretation. But setting the Vatican view aside as out of the question, a Catholic will find himself in good company, whether he interpret the "rock" as meaning the true faith in our Lord's Messiahship and Godhead, or as meaning Christ, or as meaning S. Peter. All these various interpretations are perfectly consonant with the Church's teaching about herself; but, of course, only one of them can be the true meaning which our Lord intended to express when He first uttered the words.¹ Dogmatically they are all admissible, but exegetically one of them is right, and the others are wrong. Let us, therefore, now proceed to consider the passage with the view of determining, so far as we can, what our Lord really meant to promise to S. Peter. I shall confine myself for the present to that part of the promise, which is contained in the words, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church."

To my mind it appears most probable that our Lord intended, when He used the expression "this rock," to signify by it S. Peter. The apostle had been confessing his faith in the Messiahship and in the divine Sonship of the Lord Jesus. It was the first open confession of faith in those great facts, which had been made by any of the apostles since the Lord had gathered the twelve together into one band, and had given them their preliminary mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.² This confession of the faith by S. Peter was a great moment in the progress of the events which were preparing the way for the manifestation of the kingdom of God. The truth had been inwardly revealed to him, and his loyal heart, enabled by preventing grace, had grasped the great verity which the Father set before him; and so he answered our Lord's inquiry and said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." It was fitting that our Lord should reward His servant's faith by some signal token of His approval; and so the Lord answers, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I also

¹ Though the various interpretations are all dogmatically admissible, they cannot all be held together as the true interpretation of our Lord's words. To build the Church on the ever-living Christ is one thing; to build on S. Peter's evangelizing labours wrought long ago is another thing; to build on the universal episcopate is a third thing; to build on the true faith is a fourth thing. In these different connexions the expression "build upon" is used in varying shades of meaning, and our Lord, when He spoke to S. Peter, cannot have intended us to understand the word "rock," as used by Him, to denote at the same time a living divine Person, a doctrine, the work of a man who died eighteen centuries ago, and an order of men living all over the world and sharing in an office which is perpetuated from generation to generation.

² S. Matt. x. 5, 6.

say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church: and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it," etc. Our Lord's words evidently convey a promise to *S. Peter*. One feels that if our Lord had said, "Thou art *Peter*, and upon *Myself* I will build My Church," such a promise would hardly seem suitable to the situation. Moreover, Christ is here the *Builder*, and it seems awkward to have the Builder and the Foundation one. It must also be remembered that our Lord spoke in Aramaic, and that in that language the word for "Peter" and the word for "rock" are identical. Our Lord's words may be represented thus: "Thou art Cepha, and upon this Cepha I will build My Church." If no tolerable sense could be assigned to the passage when Cepha the figurative rock is identified with Cepha the person, it might then seem permissible to search for other interpretations; but if the *primâ facie* interpretation yields a good meaning, it ought to be given precedence. And surely in this case the *primâ facie* interpretation does yield an excellent meaning, which is borne out by parallel passages in the New Testament. We nowhere read in the New Testament of the Church being built upon the true faith, but we do find that S. Paul, writing to the Gentile Christians at Ephesus, says, "Ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets;"¹ and we do find that S. John, in the Apocalypse, describing the Church triumphant, the holy city, the new Jerusalem, says that "the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb."² It is clear, therefore, that the notion of the Church being built upon apostles is a scriptural notion. Let us try and discover what is exactly conveyed by that notion. And, first of all, we must observe that in the passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians prophets are joined with the apostles—"Built upon the foundation of the apostles *and prophets*." Who are these prophets? It seems evident, from two other passages in this same Epistle, that S. Paul is alluding, not to the Old Testament prophets, but to the New Testament prophets, who in the earliest days, while the Church was being founded, constituted a degree of the sacred ministry inferior only to that of the apostles; as it is written, "He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists."³ And so, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, S. Paul says, "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets."⁴ The apostles and prophets,

¹ Eph. ii. 19, 20.

³ Eph. iv. 11; cf. iii. 5.

² Rev. xxi. 14.

⁴ 1 Cor. xii. 28.

therefore, on whom the Church is founded, are the leaders and chiefs of those evangelical labourers who, by their preaching and teaching, brought the first generation of Christians to the knowledge of Christ, and gathered them into the Church. They organized and took the lead in the work of foundation, and so to them has been granted the high honour of being called the foundation of the Church. It is thus that the admirable Roman Catholic commentator Estius explains this passage. He says that the apostles and prophets constitute the foundation of the Church, "through their ministry, in so far as they announced to men the doctrine of salvation through Christ only, which they had received from God."¹ With Estius agrees the Jesuit commentator, Cornelius à Lapide.² And so Bishop Barry, in his note on the passage, says, "The apostles and prophets are the foundation . . . as setting forth in word and grace Him who is the Corner-stone."³ I have not come across any commentators, either ancient or modern, either Romanist, Anglican, or Protestant, who suppose that, either in the passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians or in the passage in the Apocalypse, the bishops, as successors of the apostles, are to be joined with them as sharing in the glory of being the foundation of the Church. To the bishops is committed the duty of building the upper stories of the temple; the apostles laid the foundation, and by their founding labours have merited to be themselves styled the foundation. As Cornelius à Lapide says, the apostles "are the Church's foundations and founders (for these two expressions come back to the same meaning)."⁴

These parallel passages seem to suggest the true interpretation of our Lord's promise to S. Peter. We know that S. Peter and the other apostles are the foundations of the Church, because he and they are co-founders of the Church.⁵ What is there to make us suppose that he is also a foundation of the Church in some totally different sense, of which we have no trace elsewhere in the Bible? If we look to the last clause of the promise, we shall find a signal confirmation of this view, that what was promised to S. Peter was to be actually conferred on all the apostles equally. The last

¹ Estius, *In Eph.* ii. 19, 20.

² A Lapide, *in loc.*

³ Bishop Barry, *in loc.*, in the *New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, edited by Bishop Ellicott.

⁴ A Lapide, *In Apoc. S. Joh.*, xxi. 14.

⁵ Father Bottalla, S.J. (*Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 60), says very truly, "The apostleship had only one definite task to perform—that of laying the foundations of the Church. Those once laid, the apostleship gave way to the ordinary and regular government."

clause of our Lord's promise to S. Peter runs thus: "Whatsoever *thou* shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever *thou* shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."¹ But shortly afterwards, as is recorded in S. Matt. xviii., our Lord made this very same promise to all the apostles. He said, "Verily I say unto *you*, What things soever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever *ye* shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."² If all the apostles were intended to share in the power promised to S. Peter in the last clause, there seems no reason why they should not share in the honour promised to him in the first clause.³ What, then, was the special reward which he received? Why, this—that as he was the first to confess publicly the Messiahship and divine Sonship of the Master, so *to him first* were *promised* the honours and labours and powers of the apostolic office. Up to the time of his confession our Lord had revealed nothing plainly concerning His Church. He had never hitherto used the word "Church." Now for the first time He speaks of His Church, and He makes known to S. Peter that he is to be a foundation of it, and a ruler over it. Whether the others are to share with S. Peter, is for the present kept back. Surely this precedence in designation was a fitting reward for S. Peter's promptness in confession. Moreover, other results flowed out of this precedence. It was not the first time that he had been singled out as the leader. When our Lord originally separated the twelve, we are told that "He called unto Him His twelve disciples;"⁴ and the evangelist goes on to say that "the names of the twelve apostles are these: *The first*, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother;"⁵ and then the rest are enumerated. Evidently on that earlier occasion, our Lord named S. Peter's name first. So that not once, but twice, the Lord seemed to sanction the view that S. Peter was to be the leader. All the apostles were peers and equals; all were to be founders and foundations of the Church; all were to have the power of binding and loosing; all after the Resurrection received authority to remit and retain sins; all were commissioned to go into the world to preach, and to disciple, and to baptize. But among these

¹ S. Matt. xvi. 19.

² S. Matt. xviii. 18.

³ After what has been said in the text about the first and last clauses of the promise to S. Peter, it seems unnecessary to set out at length an elaborate proof that the middle clause of the promise—"I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"—belongs to all the apostles, and not to S. Peter only. The reader is referred to Dr. Pusey's Note R on *The keys given to the Church in the person of S. Peter*, in the Oxford translation of Tertullian, pp. 514, 515; and to De Launoi's Epistle to Hadrianus Vallantius (Lib. ii., Ep. v., *Opp.*, ed. 1731, tom. v. pars ii. pp. 213-242). Compare also passages from the Fathers, quoted on pp. 86, 471, and 488.

⁴ S. Matt. x. 1.

⁵ S. Matt. x. 2.

equals S. Peter was singled out by our Lord to be the leader—the first.¹ He was *primus inter pares*. And accordingly in everything connected with the foundation of the Church he took the lead. It was he who proposed that steps should be taken to fill up the gap in the apostolic college caused by the death of the traitor Judas. It was he, standing up with the eleven, who preached the great Pentecostal sermon on the Church's Pentecostal birthday. He took the initiative and was the chief agent in the first miracle that was wrought on the lame man at the beautiful gate of the temple, though here S. John was associated with him. He was the spokesman when the first punishment was inflicted on members of the Church who had sinned, as appears in the history of Ananias and Sapphira. He with S. John went to confirm the newly baptized Samaritans, and so was the principal agent for conveying the sanction of the apostolic college to the extension of the Church into that border-land between Judaism and heathendom. He with S. John confronted Simon Magus, the first heretic. Above all, as he himself pointed out to the other apostles, "God made choice among them, that by his mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and should believe;"² in other words, he first opened the door of the Church to uncircumcised Gentiles by the instruction and baptism of Cornelius and his friends. Thus were the foundations of the Church laid by the combined action of all the apostles, but in that founding work S. Peter had the leadership, and took the initiative. I do not doubt that this recognized leadership resulted from the precedence in designation to the apostolic office, which came to him as a reward for his priority in confessing the truth about our Lord's Person. The reward was most real and most marked, though it did not involve any primacy of jurisdiction over the other apostles, nor was it ever intended that either the primacy of honour which S. Peter did enjoy, or the supposed primacy of jurisdiction of which there is no trace in Scripture,³ should be perpetuated for all time in a divinely instituted monarchy over the Church of God, to be inherited by the long line of bishops, who from the apostles' time onwards have governed the local Church of Rome.

Surely it must be allowed to be most significant that the New Testament, which is so clear on the subject of S. Peter's *leadership* in the foundation of the Church, is so absolutely

¹ See Additional Note 54, p. 473, for the teaching of representative Anglican divines on the subject of S. Peter's primacy of order among the apostles.

² Acts xv. 7.

³ On the meaning of our Lord's words, "Feed My sheep," see Appendix C, pp. 117-128.

silent in regard to any jurisdiction over the other apostles vested in him, or exercised by him. But the papal theory, if it is to establish for itself a scriptural basis, must produce scriptural proofs of the exercise by S. Peter of *supreme jurisdiction* over the Church. No amount of leadership avails to prove jurisdiction. When S. Paul and S. Barnabas were engaged in their first missionary journey, S. Paul's superior gifts soon established him in the position of leader. He was the "chief speaker."¹ The members of the expedition, of whom S. Barnabas was one, are described as "Paul and his company."² But will any one maintain that S. Paul had any primacy of jurisdiction over S. Barnabas? The idea is, of course, absurd. Leadership and jurisdiction are two wholly different things. The distinction is quite understood at Rome. The Vatican Council strikes with its anathema any one who says that S. Peter received from our Lord "only a primacy of honour"—that is, a leadership, "but not a primacy of true and proper jurisdiction."

But we go further in this matter. As we deny that there are any passages of Holy Scripture which prove that supreme jurisdiction over the other apostles was ever exercised by S. Peter, so we are also prepared to assert that the general tenor of Scripture is adverse to the claim which is made on his behalf.

If S. Peter possessed a divinely given primacy of jurisdiction over the other apostles, it seems very strange that the latter, when they heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, should "*send* to them Peter and John."³ One could understand a vassal kingdom, not exactly sending, but petitioning, its king to plead the cause of his kingdom in the court of the suzerain. And if the king consented to undertake such an office, it is inconceivable that other nobles should be joined with him as members of the delegation. They might accompany him as part of his *suite*; they would never share with him in the duty which he had undertaken to fulfil. But if even a vassal king would never be *sent* by his subjects to represent them in the higher court of the suzerain, how much less would a wholly independent sovereign be sent by the subordinate rulers of his people to carry out some plan on which they had decided! The fact that the apostles sent S. Peter and S. John to confirm the Samaritans, is proof positive that S. Peter was not the supreme ruler of the others. That two equal apostles should be sent by the

¹ Acts xiv. 12.

² Acts xiii. 13.

³ Acts viii. 14. Mr. Brightman calls my attention to the fact that in this passage S. Luke uses the word ἀπέστειλαν and not ἐπεμψαν. On the distinction between the two words, see Bishop Westcott's Additional Note on S. John xx. 21.

college of apostles—that is natural; that the subject apostles should send their supreme pontiff and one of their fellow-subjects on a joint mission—that is incredible.

Again, if S. Peter occupied in the apostolic Church the position which is claimed for the pope by the Vatican Council, how is it conceivable that S. Paul, writing to the Galatians and describing his third¹ visit to Jerusalem, should say that, “when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who are recognized as pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision”?² How could he possibly put S. James before S. Peter in an enumeration of the leading apostles?³ and how could he possibly say of S. Peter, if he was the foundation of the Church in a special sense—in a sense, that is, in which the other apostles were not the foundation,—how could he possibly say of such a one that he and two other apostles “are recognized as pillars”? Let us try and imagine a parallel case in modern times. Suppose that two distinguished Roman Catholic missionary bishops, whose line of action had been called in question by other Roman Catholics, had come to Rome during the Vatican Council, and been granted an audience by the pope; and suppose that there had been present at the audience two other prelates, leading members of the council; let us say, the Archbishop of Paris and the so-called Archbishop of Westminster. Can we imagine one of the two missionary bishops writing afterwards to his accusers, and describing his interview at the Vatican in such terms as the following? Can we imagine his saying, “When they perceived the grace that was given unto me, Archbishop Darboy,⁴ Pope Pius IX.,

¹ But see the *Addendum* to this Lecture on pp. 116, 117.

² Gal. ii. 9.

³ It is no answer to this to say that in other Epistles S. Paul gives Cephas priority over all other apostles. Supposing that he does, it will only show that S. Peter had a primacy of order among the twelve. But the fact that in this place, where S. Paul is speaking of Jerusalem, he puts the local bishop before S. Peter, proves clearly to my mind that S. Peter's position was quite different from the position of the pope. The pope would never be named second by any Roman Catholic in such an enumeration. In connexion with this matter, it may be well to warn the reader that in 1 Cor. xv. 5 no precedence is given by S. Paul to S. Peter, because he is narrating the historical order of events. Nor can 1 Cor. i. 12 be referred to; because S. Paul's natural courtesy would make him give precedence to the senior apostle over himself, and Apollos was not of apostolic rank. It is, I think, fair to quote 1 Cor. ix. 5 in favour of S. Peter's primacy of order.

⁴ Perhaps it will be said that Archbishops Darboy and Manning had not that gift of apostolic infallibility which belonged to S. James and S. John, and that therefore the disparity of position which separated the archbishops from the pope is greater than that which separated the two subject-apostles from S. Peter. But such an argument goes only a very little way towards getting over the difficulty. If S. Peter had a divinely given primacy of supreme jurisdiction over the other

and Archbishop Manning, who are recognized as pillars, gave to me and my companion the right hands of fellowship"? Such a statement, coming from a devout Roman Catholic who accepts the doctrine set forth in the Vatican decrees, and occurring in a letter addressed by him to persons also belonging to the Roman communion, would be absolutely impossible. Why, then, was it not only possible but natural to S. Paul to use such language in a letter addressed to his Galatian converts? Because neither he nor they held the doctrine of the papal primacy which was set forth in the Vatican decrees. Because it had never entered their minds that such a doctrine would ever be devised and propagated by Christian men.

But perhaps some one will reply that, if any primacy, even if it be only of honour and influence, is granted to S. Peter, there is a difficulty in accounting for his being named after S. James. I see no difficulty whatsoever within S. James' own city and diocese. Outside the jurisdiction of the Church of Jerusalem, S. Peter would certainly, I should suppose, have been named before S. James. And if he had had immediate actual jurisdiction over all the pastors, and all the faithful throughout the universal Church, he would have been named before S. James in Jerusalem as well as elsewhere. But if he only had a primacy of honour, then as soon as Jerusalem had been erected into a diocese, and an apostle like S. James¹ had become its local bishop, S. James alone would have ordinary jurisdiction within the city, and therefore, according to every principle of Catholic order, S. James, being himself an apostle, ought of right to take precedence.²

apostles, he could never have been named second, and it could never have been said of him in such a context that he and two others "are recognized as pillars." To make the parallel quite apposite, the council ought to have taken place at Paris, and not at Rome.

¹ Although S. James was probably not one of the twelve, yet it seems clear that, like S. Paul and S. Barnabas, he was ranked among the apostles. In Acts ix. 27 S. Luke says that Barnabas took Paul "and brought him to the apostles" (*πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους*). But S. Paul himself, describing the same event in Gal. i. 18, 19, says, "I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas. . . . But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." Bishop Lightfoot, commenting on Gal. i. 19, expresses his opinion that the plural word *ἀποστόλους* in Acts ix. 27 is "in favour of" the view that S. James was an apostle. But it is fair to add that he holds (why, I know not) that "this argument must not be pressed." However, after a careful discussion of the exact meaning of Gal. i. 19, he arrives at the result that "it seems . . . that S. James is here called an apostle." Estius (*in loc.*) says that there is "no one who denies that James, the brother of the Lord, was an apostle." Compare also I Cor. xv. 7.

² It should, perhaps, be mentioned that there are traces in the early Church of an idea that the bishopric of the Church of Jerusalem, the mother-Church of Christendom, was a higher dignity than the apostolate. Thus S. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 190-203), in his *Ἰστοριώσεις* (quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 1), writes, "They say that after the ascension of the Saviour, Peter and James and John, as being those who received the chief honour from our Lord, strove not after glory (*μη ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης*), but chose James the Just Bishop of Jerusalem."

In a previous lecture I pointed out an analogous case.¹ Within the province of Milan, the Council of Turin (A.D. 398) naturally names S. Ambrose of Milan before the pope. That could not be done now, because the pope is supposed to have ordinary jurisdiction *jure divino* at Milan and at Turin and everywhere else. But in the fourth century it was otherwise; and it was also otherwise in the age of the apostles. S. Peter, when in Jerusalem, was ecclesiastically S. James' guest; and in his own house the host naturally takes precedence of the guests. S. Paul therefore adopts the natural and right order, if rightness and naturalness in such a matter are to be determined by Catholic principles of jurisdiction. He adopted an order which is indefensible and inexplicable, if the teaching of the Vatican decrees is accepted as true and apostolic.

These observations will help us to understand why S. James apparently presided at the Council of Jerusalem. It will be allowed on all hands that, if any one presided at that council—and one hardly sees how such an assembly could be carried on without a president—it was either S. James or S. Peter who occupied that post. Now, the order of proceedings in the council, as set forth by S. Luke in Acts xv., was as follows. There was first of all "much disputation."² Then there was a speech by S. Peter, who recalled what had happened to Cornelius and his friends at the time of their conversion; how God had given them the Holy Ghost, even as He had given Him to the apostles and to the Jewish Christians. Then S. Peter appeals to the council not to put an unbearable yoke on the necks of the new Gentile Christians; and he expresses his view that the whole council believes that all Christians, whether Jewish or Gentile, are equally saved by the grace of Christ; and he implies that consequently circumcision and the keeping of the Mosaic law cannot be set forth as conditions of salvation.³ Then followed speeches from S. Paul and S. Barnabas, rehearsing the miraculous

So Rufinus (*H. E.*, lib. ii. cap. i., ed. Basil., 1535, p. 24), giving the sense rather than literally translating the passage of S. Clement just quoted, speaks of S. James as "the bishop of the apostles;" and S. Hesychius "the Theologian" (Migne's *Patrol. Graec.*, xciii. 1480) calls him "the exarch of the apostles" (but concerning S. Hesychius, see p. 114, n. 3). However, it is quite possible that this notion of the bishopric of Jerusalem being the highest dignity in the Church may have been derived from the Clementine romance, in which S. James is represented as a sort of hyper-apostolic pope (see Additional Note 13, p. 443). The grain of truth which lay at the bottom of these fancies was undoubtedly the fact that *in Jerusalem* S. James, after his elevation to the episcopal throne, took precedence of S. Peter and the other apostles.

¹ See pp. 58, 59.

² So Liddell and Scott translate the word *συζητησις*, referring specially to Acts xv. 7.

³ Acts xv. 7-11.

attestations of their work among the Gentiles, showing that it had God's approval.¹ Then finally S. James, after recalling what S. Peter had said about God's dealings with Cornelius, and after showing that all this work among the Gentiles had been predicted long before by the prophets,² proceeds to formulate a decision, which he sets forth for the council to adopt. "Wherefore," he says, "*my judgement is* (διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω) that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles turn to God, but that we write unto them that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood."³ Such was the order of proceedings at that council; and in regard to them I observe, first, that S. Peter spoke neither first nor last; nor did he formulate any decision for the council's acceptance; nor did he promulgate his own authoritative judgement as an immediate preparation for the synodical decision. After much previous debating (συνζητήσεως), he spoke as a member of the council, and recalled certain important events in which he had borne an important part, and which ought to be taken into account in arriving at a decision. His speech is, of course, a weighty speech, but neither in respect of the time when it was delivered nor in its character is it the speech of a president.⁴ When S. Peter had finished, S. Paul and S. Barnabas continued the debate, and contributed additional facts which would help to bring the council to a right decision. Then S. James speaks last, just as in the great Council of Carthage, about the baptism of heretics, S. Cyprian, the president, gives his own opinion last.⁵ And S. James' speech is eminently

¹ Acts xv. 12.

² Acts xv. 14-18.

³ Acts xv. 19, 20. S. Hesychius, "the Theologian" (ὁ θεολόγος), an illustrious doctor of the Church, who flourished A.D. 412-423, hits the nail on the head when he says (Migne's *Patrol. Graec.*, xciii. 1480), "Peter makes a speech in the assembly, but James legislates" (Πέτρος δημηγορεῖ, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβος νομοθετεῖ). In these words S. Hesychius expresses accurately and tersely the relative positions of S. James and S. Peter at the council, as they are set forth in S. Luke's narrative. Nevertheless, though the passage expresses the truth, I should not lay stress on it in controversy, because S. Hesychius was a priest of the Church of Jerusalem. No candid person will press statements about S. Peter written by Roman popes or by Antiochene Fathers; and, similarly, it is unsafe to go to the Church of Jerusalem to learn about S. James.

⁴ Bishop Lightfoot (*S. Clement of Rome*, ed. 1890, ii. 490), contrasting S. Peter's marked primacy in the early days of the Church, as recorded in the first twelve chapters of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, with the silence about him in the later apostolic history, says, "In the first part he is everything: in the subsequent record he is nowhere at all. He is only once again mentioned in the Acts (xv. 7), and even here he does not bear the chief part. Where the Church at large, as an expansive missionary Church, is concerned, Paul, not Peter, is the prominent personage; where the Church of Jerusalem appears as the visible centre of unity, James, not Peter, is the chief agent (Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18; Gal. ii. 9, 12). Peter retains the first place as missionary evangelist to the Hebrew Christians [and to their unconverted Hebrew brethren], but nothing more."

⁵ S. Cyprian, as president, had also made an opening speech, in which he

the speech of a president. It formulates the decision. It introduces the authoritative word *κρίνω*. It immediately prepares the way for that unanimous act of the whole council to which they allude in their synodical letter, when they say, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you (Gentiles) no greater burden than these necessary things;" and then they enumerate the things which S. James had mentioned in his presidential summing up. That final synodical act appears to be based on S. James' speech.¹ Altogether it seems quite clear that S. James presided on this occasion, as we should naturally expect to be the case. No wonder that S. Chrysostom, in his homily on this passage in the Book of Acts, says, "This James was bishop, as they say, and therefore he speaks last;" and a little further on he adds, "Peter indeed spoke more strongly, but he [James] here more mildly; for thus it behoves one in high authority to leave what is unpleasant for others to say, while he himself appears in the milder part."² Evidently, in the opinion of S. Chrysostom, S. James, who was an apostle equally with S. Peter, took precedence of him in this council, as being

referred to the opinion on rebaptism which he had expressed in his letter to Jubaianus; but his synodical judgement was reserved to the end, and was delivered after his eighty-four colleagues had spoken. So in the third and fourth sessions of the Vatican Council, the Fathers of the council first of all expressed their judgement on the decrees and canons which had been proposed, and finally Pius IX., who presided, concluded the matter by declaring his own supreme sentence.

¹ See Additional Note 55, p. 477.

² The English rendering is taken from the Oxford translation of S. Chrysostom's Thirty-third Homily on the Acts (p. 456). That translation agrees accurately with the Greek text in the New College manuscript (tom. ii. fol. 102), except that the Oxford translator has substituted "James" for "he." I have replaced the "he," but have retained the Oxford "James" within brackets. The Greek text has *ὁυτος*. The New College *codex* is one of the four manuscripts that give what is called "*the old text*," which, as the Oxford translators say in their Preface to Part II. (p. ix.), is "incomparably better," as well as "older" than the text given in the Benedictine edition. Dr. Rivington, in *Dependence* (pp. 24, 25), makes what must be called a desperate attempt to make out that "the antithesis is between James and the Judaizers, not James and Peter." The only answer that need be given is to refer the reader to the Oxford translation of the whole passage, with its context. The interpretation suggested by Dr. Rivington is simply impossible. Mr. Gore has replied to some other remarks of Dr. Rivington, in which the latter deals with an earlier sentence of the same homily, and in which he relies on the unfortunate Benedictine text. See the Preface to the third edition of Mr. Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, which is reprinted in the *fourth edition* (pp. xiv., xv.). Second thoughts are not always best. Dr. Rivington says that in his controversy with Bishop Meurin he "was misled" by the Oxford translation. The real fact is that the Oxford translators have accurately given the meaning of the genuine text. Afterwards Dr. Rivington was really "misled" by the Benedictine editors. Dr. Rivington "reprehends" the Oxford translators for putting "James" as the translation of *ἐκεῖνος* in that earlier passage. That rendering accurately gives the meaning; and the translators gave fair warning in their Preface to Part II. (p. xiii.), that they proposed "to give faithfully, though not always literally, the sense." They have certainly, in this case, fulfilled their promise.

bishop of the city where the council was held, and therefore president thereof. Such a view is irreconcilable with the papal theory as set forth in the Vatican decrees.

I might go on to refer to other passages of the New Testament, as, for example, to S. Paul's rebuke of S. Peter at Antioch; to the way in which he deals with the parties at Corinth, who named themselves after himself, and Apollos, and Cephas, and Christ; to the tone of absolute independence of any superior human authority which pervades S. Paul's writings; to the whole tone of S. Peter's own Epistles; but I think that I have said enough to justify the assertion, which I made, that the general tenor of Scripture is adverse to the claim which is made on S. Peter's behalf.

I would add that, if S. Peter's connexion with the see of Rome is a fact of such fundamental importance, as would be the case if the theory set forth by the Vatican Council were true, it is most extraordinary that there is no *clear* allusion in the New Testament to that connexion. Believing, as I do, that the words of S. Peter in 1 S. Pet. v. 13, "She that is in Babylon, elect together with you," refer to the Church in Rome,¹ I grant that there is in that passage an *obscure* allusion to a connexion between S. Peter and the Church of Rome. He was evidently at Rome when he wrote his First Epistle, and in friendly relations with the Roman Church, whose salutation he sends to the Christians in various provinces of Asia Minor. But the New Testament nowhere certifies to us that S. Peter shared in the work of founding the Church of Rome, nor that he joined with his brother apostle in the consecration of Linus, its first bishop, however true those facts may be. Still less does it give any sanction to the fable of his having been himself the first Bishop of Rome, nor to the groundless theory that he transmitted to S. Linus and his successors a primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church, which he never claimed for himself. If, as De Maistre thought, "the supremacy of the pope is the capital dogma without which Christianity cannot subsist," why is there nothing about it in the Scriptures of truth?

Addendum to Lecture III.

In the observations on Gal. ii. 9, which I have made above, on pp. 111-113, I have assumed the correctness of the view which has been traditional among commentators, namely, that S. Paul in Gal. ii. is referring to what is commonly reckoned as his *third* visit to Jerusalem. Professor Ramsay, in his recently published *Historical Commentary on the Galatians*, and in other earlier works, has given strong reasons for

¹ Dr. Hort takes the same view. See his commentary on 1 S. Pet., p. 6.

believing that S. Paul is referring to some visit which preceded his reputed *third* visit to the holy city. It does not, however, appear to me that my argument is affected by this correction, though perhaps, if I had had it in mind when I wrote the observations to which I am referring, I should have made some slight changes in the wording of one or two sentences.

APPENDIX C.

On our Lord's words to S. Peter (S. John xxi. 15-17), "*Feed My lambs ;*" "*Tend My sheep ;*" "*Feed My sheep*" (see p. 97).

I PROPOSE in this appendix to discuss the second great passage, to which reference is made by the Vatican Council in its dogmatic decree concerning "the institution of the apostolic primacy in blessed Peter." It will be remembered that the council sets forth, as the scriptural basis of the doctrine declared and defined in that decree, two utterances of our Lord to S. Peter, namely, first, the promise made at Caesarea Philippi, which begins with the words, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church ;" and, secondly, the injunction repeated three times with slight changes in the words used, when our Lord appeared to S. Peter and six other disciples on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias after His resurrection from the dead. On what the council calls "the manifest teaching" of these two passages it builds up its theory that, "when compared with the other apostles, whether taken separately or collectively, Peter alone was invested by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction,"¹ and that this primacy "was conferred upon blessed Peter himself immediately and directly."

I have dealt with the first of these two passages in the third lecture. I now proceed to quote the second passage together with the whole context, as it is translated in the Revised Version : "When they had broken their fast, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord ; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My lambs. He saith to him again a second time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord ; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Tend My sheep.² He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things ; Thou knowest that I love Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed My sheep."³

¹ "Solum Petrum prae caeteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque jurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum" (*Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 483).

² In the place of "*Tend My Sheep*" (ποιμανε τὰ πρόβατά μου), the Douay Version, following the Vulgate, repeats the previous formula, "*Feed My lambs.*" Apart from this variation, the Douay differs in this passage from the Revised in no point of any importance.

³ S. John xx. 15-17.

All manner of interesting questions suggest themselves to us in connexion with this wonderfully beautiful episode; but for our present purpose the really important problems to be solved are these: Why was this injunction given to S. Peter rather than to the other apostles? and again, Was any power then and there communicated to S. Peter? or was it rather that he was authorized and enjoined to use a power previously given? and once more, Of what sort was the power which our Lord was imparting, or the exercise of which He was enjoining?

The Roman reply to these questions is this—that our Lord intended to make S. Peter pope, and to give him a primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church, including the apostolic college; and that this primatial jurisdiction, which was to be transmitted to his successors in the see of Rome, was communicated to him then and there by our Lord's words, "Feed My lambs," and "Feed My sheep." I am not aware that any of the great Fathers of the first five centuries take this view, though the germ of it could doubtless be found in the writings of the popes of the fifth century and of persons closely connected with them.

Setting aside the theories held by what Mr. Gore has called the papal school,¹ there are two views which find favour with the Fathers. They are not necessarily exclusive of each other, and in fact some of the Fathers seem to have held them in combination; but logically they are quite independent, the one of the other. They agree in this, that they suppose that the right and duty of shepherding and feeding the sheep and the lambs belong to S. Peter as an *apostle*, rather than as the foreman of the apostles. It is his *apostolic* jurisdiction which he is enjoined to use, or which is being committed to him; and the "sheep" which he is to feed are not his brother shepherds and co-apostles, but rather such members of the flock of Christ as are spiritually full-grown, and capable of appreciating "solid food;" while the "lambs" are the babes in Christ, who need to be fed with "spiritual milk."² So far the two views agree, but in other points they diverge.

According to the first of these two views, our Lord addresses His injunction to S. Peter because he is the primate-apostle, and therefore the representative or symbol of the whole body of the apostles and of the unity of the Church. The others receive the injunction or the commission, whichever it was, in him, their representative. The Fathers who take this view in no way suppose that any primacy of *jurisdiction* over the other apostles is being given to S. Peter; it is because he is the first *in*

¹ It is obvious that, if our Lord really intended by the "*Pasce oves*" to institute a papal monarchy over the Church, in the persons of S. Peter and of his supposed papal successors, then these words are the operative words by which, as De Maistre would say, "the necessary, only, and exclusive foundation of Christianity" was laid. Had that been the case, the great Fathers of the Church would with one voice have dwelt on such a fundamental fact. Unfortunately for the Romanist view, they none of them, when commenting on the text, allude to the supposed fact. They are absolutely unconscious of it. Our Roman friends must not be surprised if, under such circumstances, English Catholics decline altogether to discuss the papal interpretation. It is as much out of court as the Zuinglian interpretation of "*Hoc est Corpus Meum*," or the Socinian interpretation of "*Verbum caro factum est*."

² Compare 1 Cor. ii. 6; iii. 1, 2; Heb. v. 12-14; 1 S. Pet. i. 2.

order that our Lord addresses him, although what our Lord says applies equally to all the apostles. This is S. Augustine's view.¹

According to the second view, S. Peter is addressed because of his previous fall. In consequence of that fall he had either lost his apostolic commission, or, at any rate, was doubtful whether he ought to use it; and he needed either to have it restored to him, or to be encouraged and enjoined to act upon it. This is the view of S. Cyril of Alexandria.²

For myself, if it is not impertinent to say so, I have no sort of dogmatic objection to the first of these views. It harmonizes thoroughly with Catholic principles of faith and discipline. But, exegetically, I venture to think that the second view is by far the more probable. I will try to make this clear. When we look at the context of the passage we see an evident allusion to that boasting of S. Peter which led the way to his fall. Our Lord had said to the apostles on the night of the last supper, "All ye shall be offended in Me this night;" and Peter had replied, "If all shall be offended in Thee, I will never be offended."³ The boast had been made publicly, and now our Lord asks publicly the question, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me *more than these?*" S. Augustine thinks it probable that the accounts of the boasting, given by S. Matthew, S. Luke, and S. John,⁴ represent three separate occurrences,⁵ and, if so, our Lord's thrice-repeated question would correspond with the threefold boasting; but, however that may be, the fact that the interrogation by the Sea of Tiberias contains an allusion to the boast in the upper room can hardly be denied; and this prepares us to see a close connection between the threefold injunction, "Feed My lambs," "Tend My sheep," "Feed My sheep," which follows the three interrogations, and the threefold denial which followed the boasting. It was obviously important, after those terrible denials, that some public utterance should be made by our Lord certifying S. Peter and the Church that those denials were not only forgiven, so far as S. Peter's own condition in the sight of God was concerned, but that he was at liberty to use, and in fact bound to use, that apostolic office, which had been promised to him at Caesarea Philippi, and the fundamental powers of which he had received in common with the other apostles on the evening of Easter day in the upper room. S. Peter had then been made an apostle, but the remembrance of his fall might well have made him doubt whether he ought to exercise the jurisdiction given to him. Every student of Church history knows how S. Jerome, though he was made a

✓¹ See the passage from S. Augustine's 295th sermon, quoted in note 2 on p. 123.

✓² See the passage from S. Cyril's commentary on S. John xxi. 15-17, quoted on pp. 127, 128. It may be observed that Bishop Moberly, in his *Discourses on the Great Forty Days* (2nd edit., 1846, p. 190), seems to hold in combination both S. Cyril's view and S. Augustine's: he says, "Though his [Peter's] fall was great, greater than that of all who forsook their Lord and fled, yet was his restoration great too, for he was again chosen of [*i.e.* among] them all to be the one to receive, as representing all, the great pastoral commission."

✓³ S. Matt. xxvi. 31, 33.

✓⁴ S. Matt. *u.s.*; S. Luke xxii. 33; S. John xiii. 37.

✓⁵ Cf. S. Aug., *De Consens. Evang.*, lib. iii. cap. ii. (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1690, tom. iii. pars ii. col. 102).

priest, never in the whole course of his life ventured to exercise the powers of his office. It was of the utmost importance that, in the case of S. Peter, who was the leader of the apostolic college, all doubt should be removed, and his right to exercise his authority be put beyond the reach of question ; and accordingly our Lord granted to him a special authorization, three times repeated, so as to blot out the effects of his threefold fall. I think that it might be held, with some show of probability, that the threefold repetition of the injunction to feed and tend the Lord's flock implied that the three denials were so completely done away, that S. Peter was not only assured of his full and undoubted right to exercise his apostolic office, but was also restored to the leadership which had naturally resulted from his precedence in designation to that office. The threefold repetition made it evident that, notwithstanding his denials, he was not to be considered to have forfeited his primacy of honour.

I hope that this investigation of the close connexion which binds the episode of the "*Pasce oves*" to the events of the night in which our Lord was betrayed, will go far to justify S. Cyril's view, that it was in consequence of S. Peter's fall that the "*Pasce oves*" was addressed to him, rather than to any of the other apostles, or to the apostolic college.

When we consider the words which our Lord used, and compare them with a parallel passage in one of S. Peter's own Epistles, we seem to find a confirmation of the view which has already been suggested, that our Lord's words did not, strictly speaking, convey a commission, but were rather an injunction to use the apostolic commission previously bestowed. For, when S. Peter wrote to the presbyters of the churches of Asia Minor, and said, "Tend the flock of God, which is among you,"¹ he was not imparting to them the priestly office ; he was enjoining them to exercise the office which they had previously received from the Holy Ghost when they were ordained.

Before passing on to the patristic interpretation of our Lord's words, I will make one further observation, suggested by the direct consideration of the words themselves. It seems clear that those words do not of themselves imply any grant of jurisdiction to S. Peter over the other apostles. Our Lord does not say, "Act as a shepherd to thy brethren and co-apostles," but "Feed My lambs," and "Tend" and "Feed My sheep." The words evidently have reference to the pastoral office which S. Peter was going to fulfil towards the sheep and lambs of Christ's flock after the Lord Himself had ascended into heaven. Our Lord was accustomed to speak of the future members of His Church as the sheep of His flock. So, for example, in the Gospel of the Good Shepherd, He says, "Other [Gentile] sheep I have, which are not of this [Jewish] fold ; them also I must bring, and they shall become one flock, one shepherd."² Our Lord Himself is "the great Shepherd of the sheep,"³ and He appoints His ministers to be the under-shepherds, to "take heed unto all the flock," and to "tend the Church of God."⁴ That pastoral ministry began with the apostles, who were the first set of under-shepherds, and to each of whom was given pastoral authority over the whole flock. If it

¹ 1 S. Pet. v. 2.

³ Heb. xiii. 20.

² S. John x. 16.

⁴ Acts xx. 28.

were clearly revealed in other parts of Holy Scripture that S. Peter was the supreme under-shepherd, having jurisdiction over the other apostles, then it might be permissible to suppose that such supreme jurisdiction was being communicated to S. Peter by our Lord, when He said, "Feed My sheep," and that consequently on that particular occasion the inferior under-shepherds were numbered among the sheep.¹ But there is no trace in other parts of Holy Scripture of such a supremacy, and therefore there is no reason for numbering the apostolic shepherds among the sheep in the passage which we are considering. The wording of that passage, taken by itself, suggests apostolic, not primatial, jurisdiction.

Gathering up the results of our study of S. John xxi. 15-17, it seems probable that our Lord, by the words, "*Pasce oves Meas*," was not giving a new commission to S. Peter, but was authorizing and enjoining him to use a commission previously bestowed; and it seems clear that that commission was not a commission to be primate, with a rule over the apostles; but a commission to be an apostle, with a rule over the sheep and lambs belonging to the Church of God. It also seems clear that the reason why this injunction and authorization were needed by S. Peter and were not needed by the others, is to be found in S. Peter's fall, when he denied the Lord.

I proceed now to investigate the interpretations of our Lord's words to S. Peter, which are to be found in the writings of the Fathers. They refer continually to our Lord's injunction to feed the sheep, but when they speak of it in connexion with the apostolic age, they assume that all the apostles shared in the commission; or, if S. Peter is specially mentioned, they point out that he is the representative of the Church, or the symbol of her unity, or else they dwell on his fall. They seem to take pains to make it clear that S. Peter had no authority given to him which was peculiar to himself. And again, when the Fathers speak of our Lord's injunction in connexion with post-apostolic times, they dwell on the fact that the bishops, as the successors of the apostles, or as the successors of Peter, have inherited the pastoral commission. A modern Romanist naturally dwells on the *papal* power as guaranteed by the *Pasce oves*; the Fathers, ignoring the papacy,² consider that our Lord was instructing or empowering the *episcopate*.

I cannot attempt any exhaustive catena, but I will give specimens of the teaching of both Latin and Greek Fathers.

S. Cyprian, writing to Pope Stephen, says, "Although we [bishops]

¹ During the years of our Lord's ministry in the days of His humiliation, the twelve constituted our Lord's special flock, and He Himself was their visible Shepherd. That was before they received their apostolic commission. That period culminated in the night in which our Lord was betrayed; and, referring to the events of that night, He applied to them all, including S. Peter, the title of sheep. He said, "All ye shall be offended in Me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad" (S. Matt. xxvi. 31). But after our Lord's resurrection, in preparation for His departure, He commissioned those disciples to be apostles; and so, while they all, including S. Peter, remained sheep in relation to our Lord, they became shepherds in relation to the Church.

² The papal school of the fifth and later centuries must, of course, be excepted (see pp. 99, 100).

are many shepherds, yet we feed one flock, and ought to gather together and cherish all the sheep which Christ has acquired by His own Blood and Passion."¹ I quote this passage, although it does not explicitly refer to our Lord's words to S. Peter; but they must have been in S. Cyprian's mind when he wrote. He was writing to the pope, and asking him to help the Church in Gaul. That was surely a good opportunity for pressing on him the duty of exercising the supreme pastoral office, which is supposed by Romanists to belong to the Roman successors of S. Peter. But instead of that, S. Cyprian puts all bishops on an equality in their pastoral functions, and urges the pope to interfere in Gaul, not as having primatial jurisdiction there, but as belonging to the college of bishops, who all "feed one flock, and ought to gather together and cherish all the sheep" of Christ.²

Even the Romanizing interpolator of S. Cyprian's treatise on the *Unity of the Church*, after inserting a reference to the *Pasce oves*, proceeds a few lines lower down to say concerning the apostles, "They all are shepherds, and the flock is shown to be one, which is fed by all the apostles with one-minded concord."³ The interpolator evidently held that, though for symbolical reasons the words were spoken to S. Peter only, the injunction or commission applied to all the apostles. It is clear that he considered that our Lord was dealing with apostolic, and not with primatial, jurisdiction.

S. Augustine is very clear and express. In his treatise, *De Agone Christiano*, he is proving, in opposition to the Luciferians, that the Church is right in dealing mercifully with penitents. In the course of his argument he says, "Not without cause among all the apostles doth Peter sustain the person of this Church Catholic; for unto this Church were the keys of the kingdom of heaven given, when they were given unto Peter; and when it is said unto him, it is said unto all, 'Lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep.'⁴ S. Augustine means that S. Peter, as being the apostle who was the special example of penitence, was fitly chosen to be the representative and first in order among the rulers of the Church, which has ever dealt mercifully with penitents. He represented the Church when the keys were given to him, so that it was the Church which really received them; and similarly it was to the Church and to "all" her rulers that our Lord was really speaking when He said, "Feed My sheep." It was no solitary papal power that was then communicated, but the pastoral authority which belonged first to the apostles, and afterwards to the bishops.

Again, in his forty-seventh homily on S. John's Gospel, S. Augustine says, "Understand, then, how the Lord Jesus Christ is both Door and Shepherd: Door, by opening Himself; Shepherd, by entering in through Himself. And indeed, my brethren, as regards His pastoral office, He

¹ S. Cypr. *Ep.* lxxviii. *ad Stephanum*, § 4, *Opp.*, ii. 747.

² For a full account of the circumstances under which this letter was written, and for the reason why S. Cyprian asked Pope Stephen to interfere, see pp. 55-58.

³ S. Cypr., *De Unit. Ecd.*, § 4, *Opp.*, i. 212, note.

⁴ S. Aug., *De Agone Christiano*, cap. xxx., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., vi. 260. On S. Augustine's teaching about S. Peter as the symbol of the Church, see pp. 101-103.

hath imparted it to His members also : thus Peter too is shepherd, and Paul shepherd, and the other apostles shepherds, and good bishops shepherds. But Door, none of us calleth himself; this He hath kept proper to Himself, the way by which the sheep enter in."¹ In S. Augustine's view the pastoral authority is common to all the apostles, and to their successors the bishops.² It does not occur to him to refer to the popes as having a pastoral authority of a higher sort.

It need hardly be added that when, in his homilies on S. John's Gospel, S. Augustine reaches the last chapter, and comments on the *Pasce oves*, he says not a word about any authority in S. Peter over the other apostles, nor about any primatial jurisdiction in the Roman see. Strange, that when treating expressly of what is supposed by many Ultramontanes to be *the* fundamental proof-text of the papal power, he should so completely ignore an institution which, from their point of view, is "the principal matter of Christianity!"³

Passing to the Greek Fathers, I begin with S. Chrysostom. There are two passages in the treatise which has ever been considered S. Chrysostom's masterpiece,⁴ the *De Sacerdotio*, in which he makes clear how he understood the *Pasce oves*. In the first chapter of the second book the saint is showing that the undertaking of the burden of the episcopal office is the greatest evidence of love to Christ. He naturally bases his argument on S. John xxi. 15-17, and he says, "It was not Christ's intention [by the words, 'Feed My sheep'] to show how much Peter loved Him, because this already appeared in many ways, but how much He Himself loves His Church; and He desired that we should all learn it, that we also may be very zealous in the same work. For why did God not spare His Son and Only-begotten, but gave Him up, although he was His Only One? That He might reconcile to Himself those who were His enemies, and make them a people for His own possession. And why did He pour forth His Blood? To purchase those sheep whom He committed to Peter and to his successors"⁵ (τοὺς μετ' ἐκεῖνον). I follow Mr. Allnatt in translating τοὺς μετ' ἐκεῖνον by "to his successors."⁶ Those words give the sense very accurately and

¹ S. Aug., in *Joh. Evang. tract.* xlvi., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. pars ii. col. 608.

² I add in a note two more passages from S. Augustine, which bring out with great clearness the thought that what was enjoined on S. Peter in the *Pasce oves* was equally enjoined on all the apostles. In his 296th sermon, preached on the Feast of S. Peter and S. Paul, he discusses at some length our Lord's word, by which He commended His sheep to Peter. Then he adds, "That which was commended to Peter, that which was enjoined on him, not Peter only but also the other apostles heard, kept, observed, and chiefly the Apostle Paul, the partner of his death and of his festival" (*Opp.* S. Aug., ed. Ben., v. 4199). And in the previous sermon, the 295th, he says, "The Lord commended to Peter himself His sheep to feed. For not he alone among the disciples merited to feed the Lord's sheep; but when Christ speaks to one, unity is commended; and [He speaks] to Peter first (primitus), because among the apostles Peter is first" (*Opp.*, v. 1195). This last passage exactly expresses S. Augustine's view, as I have described it on p. 118.

³ See Bellarmine, quoted on p. 98.

⁴ Compare Tillemont, xi. 14.

⁵ *Opp.* S. Chrys., ed. Ben., i. 372.

⁶ Allnatt's *Cathedra Petri*, 2nd edit., p. 43. Mr. Allnatt's book is a

idiomatically. It is amusing to notice how Mr. Allnatt prints these words in capital letters, evidently imagining that of course S. Peter's successors must be the popes. It is needless to say that S. Chrysostom knew nothing of *papal* successors of S. Peter in his primatial office. According to S. Chrysostom's teaching, the bishops generally were S. Peter's successors, as they were also the successors of the other apostles. The whole argument of the *De Sacerdotio* requires us so to understand the words; and if further proof were needed, it would manifestly appear from the fact that, when S. Chrysostom wrote this treatise, he neither was nor ever had been in communion with the Church of Rome, and in fact he remained outside of that communion for at least seventeen more years, perhaps for as many as twenty-six.¹

S. Chrysostom's object in the *De Sacerdotio* was to comfort and encourage his friend Basil, who had just been consecrated to the episcopate. In the second chapter of the second book he says to Basil, "You are going to be set over all that is God's, and to do those things, in doing which [Christ] said that Peter would be able to outdo the other apostles; for saith He, 'Peter, lovest thou Me *more than these?* . . . Feed My sheep.'"² It is evident from both these passages that S. Chrysostom held that our Lord, in saying, "Feed My sheep," was committing to S. Peter apostolical or episcopal authority. S. Peter's office was the same as Basil's office. Basil, as a bishop, was one of S. Peter's successors. The notion of papal or primatial jurisdiction over the other apostles does not occur to S. Chrysostom.

But, though S. Chrysostom attributes no jurisdiction over the other apostles to S. Peter, he fully recognizes his primacy of order, his leadership; and as a loyal son of the Church of Antioch, which was accustomed in the fourth century to look on S. Peter as its founder, he often employs his great rhetorical powers in eloquently setting forth that leadership. But it will be found that he knows well how to magnify the primacy of order without suggesting a primacy of jurisdiction. This comes out markedly in his eighty-eighth homily on S. John's Gospel, which also throws light on his interpretation of the *Pasce oves*. S. Chrysostom begins that homily thus: "There are indeed many other things which are able to give us boldness towards God, and to shew us bright and approved, but that which most of all brings good will from on high is *tender care for our neighbour*. And this, therefore, Christ requireth of

painstaking but very unscholarly *catena* of patristic passages, which, as he supposes, are favourable to the Roman claims. The book may be of great use to any one who has the opportunity of testing the passages by investigating their context and meaning. To other persons such an uncritical performance can only be a snare and a delusion.

¹ The *De Sacerdotio* may have been written as early as A.D. 372. S. Chrysostom was not in communion with Rome until he became Bishop of Constantinople in A.D. 398. Compare pp. 365, 366.

² Πᾶσι μέλλων ἐπιστήσεσθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι, καὶ ταῦτα πράττων, ἔκαστος τὸν Πέτρον ποιῶντα ἔφησε δυνήσεσθαι καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑπερακοντίσαι τοὺς λοιπούς. Πέτρε γὰρ φήσι, φιλεῖς με πλείον τούτων; . . . ποιμαίνε τὰ πρόβατά μου (S. Chrys., *De Sacerd.*, lib. ii. cap. i. § 90, p. 13, ed. Bengel, Lipsiae, 1872). Dr. Rivington (*Dependence*, p. 18) has quoted the passage, but has mistaken its meaning.

Peter. For when their eating was ended, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My sheep.' And why, having passed by the others, doth He speak with Peter on these matters? He was the chosen one of the apostles, the mouth of the disciples, the leader of the band; on this account also Paul went up upon a time to inquire of him rather than of the others."¹ So far S. Chrysostom has been speaking of the inculcation of the duty of showing tender care for our neighbour, which our Lord pressed upon S. Peter by His injunction, "Feed My sheep," and perhaps also by His question, "Lovest thou Me more than these?" S. Chrysostom holds that this lesson was pressed on S. Peter rather than on any of the other apostles, because he was the leader. Notice how all S. Chrysostom's expressions about S. Peter in his relation to the other apostles set forth a primacy of honour, and say nothing about government or jurisdiction. The fervent preacher then passes on from our Lord's inculcation of the lesson of love to another aspect of His words. By them, as he supposes, Christ imparted or rather revived S. Peter's pastoral commission. The homily proceeds thus: "And at the same time to show him that he must now be of good cheer, since the denial was done away, He [our Lord] putteth into his hands the rule over the brethren (*τὴν προστασίαν τῶν ἀδελφῶν*); and He bringeth not forward the denial, nor reproacheth him with what had taken place, but saith, 'If thou lovest Me, rule over the brethren (*προΐστασο τῶν ἀδελφῶν*); and the warm love which thou didst ever manifest, and concerning which thou didst boast,² shew thou now; and the life which thou saidst thou wouldest lay down for Me, now give for My sheep.'" A few lines lower down S. Chrysostom says, "But He [our Lord] asketh him the third time, and the third time giveth him the same injunction, to shew at what a price He setteth the rule³ over His own sheep (*τὴν προστασίαν τῶν οἰκείων προβάτων*), and that this especially is a sign of love towards Him." S. Chrysostom repeats over and over again in this passage his view that our Lord, by the words, "Feed My sheep," committed to S. Peter "the rule over the brethren," or, in other words, "the rule over His own sheep;" that is to say, that our Lord gave to S. Peter apostolical authority over the Church. Some Ultramontane writers have tried to make out that "the brethren" here mentioned are the apostles, and that consequently S. Chrysostom held

¹ S. Chrys. *Hom.* lxxxviii. in *Joh. Ev.*, § 1, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., viii. 525. In his commentary on Gal. i. 18 (*Opp.*, x. 677), S. Chrysostom says that S. Paul went to visit S. Peter, though "he was in no need of Peter nor of his voice, but was equal in honour with him."

² I have translated *ἡγαλλιάσω* "thou didst boast." The word *ἀγαλλιάομαι* has that sense in the LXX. version of Jer. xxx. 4 (xliv. 4, Heb.); cf. Isa. xli. 16, 17. Hesychius gives *γαυριᾶ* as one out of two meanings of *ἀγάλλεται* (cf. Hesych., *Lexic.*, ed. Alberti, 1746, i. 31), and *ἀγαλλιάομαι* is a late form of *ἀγάλλομαι*. The more usual meaning of the word is "to rejoice." The allusion is, of course, to S. Peter's boasts on the night of our Lord's betrayal, which boasts led to his fall.

³ I have translated *προΐσταμαι*, the verb, and *προστασία*, the substantive, by the word "rule." It is the rendering usually adopted in the Revised Version of the New Testament, in passages connected with Church offices (e.g. Rom. xii. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12; and v. 17).

that S. Peter received jurisdiction over the apostles. But this is very far-fetched. It is plain on the surface that "the brethren" and "the sheep" are identical.¹ It is the flock of Christian believers that Christ commits to Peter, but of course not to Peter alone. All the apostles shared with him in his rule (*προστασία*) over the Church. So S. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of S. Peter and S. Paul, as being both of them "the rulers of the Church" (*οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσταταί*);² and S. Chrysostom calls S. John "the pillar (*ὁ στῦλος*) of all the churches throughout the world, who hath the keys of heaven;"³ and in this eighty-eighth homily on S. John he says that S. Peter and S. John "were about to receive the charge of the world" (*τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν ἐπιτροπήν*).⁴ Again, of S. Paul he says that "he had the care, not of one household, but also of cities, and of peoples, and of nations, and of the whole world."⁵ Ecumenical jurisdiction belongs to the very essence of the apostolical office.⁶ How, then, does S. Chrysostom account for the fact that it was to S. Peter, and not to the others, that our Lord addressed the authoritative words, "Feed My sheep"? He says that our Lord spake those words to S. Peter "to show him that he must now be of good cheer, *since the denial was done away*." According to S. Chrysostom's view, the *Pasce oves* restored to S. Peter the apostolical office, which had been suspended, so far as he was concerned, in consequence of his denial of the Lord.⁷

S. Chrysostom's view of the *Pasce oves*, and of the sort of power which was entrusted by our Lord to S. Peter when He gave him the pastoral commission, has now, I hope, been made clear. But, at the risk of being tedious, I will quote one more passage from this eighty-eighth homily on S. John, because it has been misunderstood, as if it implied that S. Peter had jurisdiction over S. John; and the misunderstanding,

¹ The word "brethren" (*ἀδελφοί*) is very commonly used in Holy Scripture in the sense of *Christians*, e.g. in Acts vi. 3; ix. 30; x. 23; xi. 29; 1 Cor. v. 11; xv. 6; Phil. i. 14, etc.; and it continued to be used in the Church in the same sense, as may be seen from the patristic passages cited in Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s.v. *ἀδελφός*. The Dominican Mamachi (*Orig. et Antiq. Christ.*, i. 6, quoted by Mr. Allies in his *Throne of the Fisherman*, p. 73, note 1) says, "Invaluit præterea apud nostros nomen *fratrum*, quod est a Christo servatore in Ecclesiam introductum, itaque deinceps propagatum est, ut non modo ab Apostolis sed etiam a Christianis omnibus usurparetur."

² S. Cyr. Hierosol. *Catech.*, vi. 15, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1720, p. 96.

³ S. Chrys. *Hom.* i. in *Joh. Ev.*, § 1, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., viii. 2.

⁴ *Hom.* lxxxviii. § 2, *Opp.*, viii. 528.

⁵ *Hom.* xxv. in *Ep.* ii. ad *Cor.*, § 2, *Opp.*, x. 614.

⁶ S. Cyril of Alexandria, in his commentary on Jacob's benediction of the Patriarch Dan, after saying that "the glorious and admirable choir of the holy apostles are set for the government of believers, and have been by Christ Himself appointed to judge," goes on to observe in reference to these same apostles, "We have had for governors, and have received for *ecumenical judges* (*κριτὰς οἰκουμενικούς*), the holy disciples" (S. Cyril. Alex. *Glaphyr. in Gen.*, lib. vii., *Opp.*, ed. Aubert., 1638, tom. i. pars ii. pp. 228, 229).

⁷ So in his fifth homily, *De Poenitentia*, S. Chrysostom says, "After that grievous fall (for there is no evil so bad as denial), but yet after so great an evil *He again restored him to his former honour* and entrusted to him the care of the universal Church (*τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκκλησίας*); and (what is greater than all), He showed to us that he had more love to the Master than all the apostles, for, saith He, 'Peter, lovest thou Me more than these?'" (*Opp.* S. Chrys., ed. Ben., ii. 311).

if it were admitted, would affect the interpretation of the whole homily. Commenting on the words, "Peter, therefore, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned back on His breast at the supper; . . . and saith, Lord, and what shall this man do?"¹ S. Chrysostom says, "Wherefore hath he reminded us of that leaning back? Not without cause or in a chance way, but to shew us what boldness Peter had after the denial. For he who then did not dare to question Jesus, but committed the office to another, this very man was even entrusted with the rule over the brethren" (that is, as we have seen, was restored to his apostolic office), "and not only doth not commit to another what relates to himself, but himself now puts a question to his Master concerning another. John is silent, but Peter speaks." S. Chrysostom is not guilty of the absurdity of attempting to prove that S. Peter had jurisdiction over S. John, because he put a question to our Lord about S. John. If there were any force in such an argument, it would follow that at the last supper, when S. John questioned our Lord at the request of S. Peter, S. John must have had jurisdiction over S. Peter, which no one has ever supposed. S. Chrysostom's point is that, after the complete forgiveness of S. Peter's denial and his full restoration to the apostolic office, he, to use S. Chrysostom's words, was "of good cheer,"² and was filled with holy "boldness." Euthymius Zigabenus, who follows S. Chrysostom point by point in his commentary on this passage,³ takes exactly the same view of the matter, and evidently understood S. Chrysostom's argument in the way in which I have tried to set it forth.⁴

But to return to the point of main interest in regard to the *Pasce oves*, namely, the reason which moved our Lord to speak those words to S. Peter rather than to the other apostles. S. Gregory Nazianzen is very explicit. Speaking of S. Peter, he says, "Jesus received him, and by the triple questioning and confession He healed the triple denial."⁵

But of all the Fathers S. Cyril of Alexandria is perhaps the fullest and the most satisfying in his treatment of this aspect of the subject. Commenting on S. John xxi. 15-17, he says, "When he [Peter] comes, Christ asks him more severely than the others, whether he loves more than they, and this took place three times. Peter assents and confesses that he loves, saying that He [Christ] is the Witness of his inward disposition. At each of his confessions separately he hears that he is charged with the care of the rational sheep. . . . Will not some one say with good reason, Wherefore did He ask the question of Simon only, although the other disciples were standing by? And what is the mean-

¹ S. John xxi. 20, 21.

² See p. 125.

³ Migne's *Patrol. Græc.*, cxxix. 1500.

⁴ It may be added, in general confirmation of the view which I have taken of S. Chrysostom's meaning in this homily, that the Benedictines decide that it was preached at Antioch, and therefore at a time when S. Chrysostom was out of communion with Rome (see pp. 365, 366). He cannot possibly have drawn from the *Pasce oves* the deductions which modern Roman Catholics draw from it, or he would not have been content to remain outside the flock, which, on their view, was being tended by the one divinely appointed universal shepherd, the necessary centre of communion.

⁵ S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxxix. § xviii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 689.

ing of 'Feed My sheep,' and the like? We say then that Saint Peter had already been appointed (*κεχειροτόνητο*) to the divine apostolate together with the other disciples: for our Lord Jesus Christ Himself named them apostles, as it is written. But when it fell out that the events connected with the plot of the Jews had come to pass, and in the meanwhile he had somewhat stumbled—for Saint Peter, overwhelmed with excessive terror, thrice denied the Lord—Christ heals the ill effects of what had happened, and demands in various terms the triple confession, setting this, as it were, against that, and providing a correction equivalent to the faults. . . . Therefore by the triple confession of blessed Peter the offence of triple denial was abolished. *But by the Lord's saying, 'Feed My sheep,' a renewal, as it were, of the apostolate already conferred upon him is understood to have taken place, wiping away the intervening reproach of his falls, and destroying utterly the littleness of soul arising from human infirmity.*"¹ Nothing could be clearer or more consistent with the Gospel narrative, except that for myself I think it more probable that the "*Feed My sheep*" was rather an injunction to exercise the apostolate, which had already been renewed, than itself the act by which the renewal took place. But that is a minor point. The important matter is that S. Cyril holds that the pastoral office spoken of by our Lord, was not primatial, but apostolical, and that the whole incident was necessitated by S. Peter's fall, which had resulted in S. Peter's apostolate being, so to speak, suspended, on which account it needed to be renewed.

Reviewing the whole of this discussion, it appears that, whether we study the passage as it occurs in S. John's Gospel, or whether we consult the comments on it to be found in the writings of the great Fathers of the Church, we find no trace of the papal interpretation. I verily believe that S. Leo invented that interpretation, or rather the germ of it. Whether he did or not, there is a *consensus* of the great Fathers in favour of the view that S. Peter had authority to feed the sheep and lambs of Christ's flock, because he was an apostle, and not because he had any primatial jurisdiction over the other apostles. In other words, the Anglican view of the passage is the Catholic view, and the Roman view is an un-Catholic view, and is in fact a grievous perversion of our Blessed Lord's meaning. On investigation, it appears that the whole of the supposed scriptural basis for the teaching of the Vatican Council about the pope's jurisdiction² collapses.

¹ S. Cyril. Alex. *in S. Joann.*, lib. xii. cap. i., ed. Phil. Pusey, 1872, iii. 164-166.

² I have not discussed S. Luke xxii. 32, because the Vatican Council makes no reference to that passage in the first chapter of the Constitution *De Ecclesiâ Christi*, in which it sets forth what it considers to be the scriptural basis of its doctrine concerning the papal primacy of jurisdiction. Later on, in the fourth chapter of the same Constitution, the Council does quote S. Luke xxii. 32 in connexion with its teaching about papal infallibility; but that is a subject on which in this book I do not enter.

LECTURE IV.

THE GROWTH OF THE PAPAL POWER FROM THE PEACE OF THE CHURCH TO THE END OF THE PONTIFICATE OF DAMASUS.

IN the last lecture I tried to show how Holy Scripture bears witness against the notion that S. Peter received from our Lord any primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church.

We have seen also in previous lectures how the great saints and rulers of the Church during the first three centuries repudiated the idea that the bishops generally were subject to the pope. On the other hand, we have seen how various causes combined to give to the Roman see a leadership in the early ages ; not a divinely instituted leadership, but a leadership growing up out of the circumstances of the time, and gladly accepted by the Church, as being for the time a useful arrangement.

We have also seen how, by the gradual isolation of S. Peter in the minds of Roman ecclesiastics, as being the supposed first occupant of the see of Rome, or else by the direct effect of the multiplication of copies of the Clementine romance, a link seemed to be provided connecting S. Peter's primacy of honour and influence, which was naturally recognized in him in virtue of his having been the first to be designated by Christ to the apostolic office, with that later primacy of honour and influence which, as the Council of Chalcedon said, was properly given by the Fathers to the throne of the elder Rome, because that was the imperial city.

We have seen how, on at least two occasions during the first three centuries, the Roman popes advanced unjustifiable claims, and attempted to meddle authoritatively with churches not subject to their jurisdiction ; and how on the latter of these two occasions, the unhistoric theory that the see of Rome, as being the see of Peter, inherits S. Peter's privileges, whether real or supposed, was pleaded as a justification of the wrongful claim.

We went on to notice how the Church, led by its great saints, resisted those attempts, and how in consequence the Roman bishops had to give way, and to content themselves with the primacy of honour which had been conferred upon them.

We have also seen to what portentous lengths the popes have advanced, as time has gone on; and what enormous authority they now claim, as of divine right, over the universal Church.

Now, of course the development of this claim has a history;¹ and it will be my object in this lecture and in the next to set before you some of the stages in that development, and some of the historical circumstances in consequence of which the growth in the papal power became possible. I can only deal with the matter in a very imperfect way, owing to the limitations of time which necessarily restrict the length of a lecture; and I propose to dwell specially on the earlier rather than on the later stages of the growth. I intend to point out from time to time indications of the continuance of

¹ It may be well, in a note, to point out that the attempt uncanonically to transform privileges of precedence and honour into a far-reaching jurisdiction is by no means peculiar to the see of Rome. Other sees, which enjoyed from one cause or another a special pre-eminence of honour, did exactly the same thing. Fallen human nature is the same all the world over. Thus the second Ecumenical Council, by its third canon, gave to the Bishop of Constantinople "the prerogative of honour next after the Bishop of Rome." This was a grant of precedence, not of jurisdiction. Seventy years later the fourth Ecumenical Council, held at Chalcedon, gave by its twenty-eighth canon patriarchal *jurisdiction* to the see of Constantinople in Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. The way had been prepared for this new departure by a series of uncanonical acts of interference on the part of the Constantinopolitan prelates in the Church affairs of those three exarchates. Dr. Bright gives a summary account of these acts in his note on the ninth canon of Chalcedon (*Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils*, pp. 157-160). Similarly, the Council of Nicaea, in its seventh canon, gave or rather confirmed to the see of Jerusalem a certain right of precedence, reserving, however, to the Palestinian Caesarea its metropolitanical dignity. As time went on, the Bishops of Jerusalem endeavoured to make themselves independent of Caesarea. "Immediately after the Council of Nicaea, the Bishop of Jerusalem, Maximus, convoked, without any reference to the Bishop of Caesarea, a synod of Palestine, . . . and proceeded further to the consecration of bishops" (Hefele, i. 407, E. tr.). There was a "contest about precedence" between Acacius of Caesarea and S. Cyril of Jerusalem. Nevertheless as late as 415 John of Jerusalem obeyed the summons of Eulogius of Caesarea, and attended a provincial council at Diospolis. At the Council of Ephesus, in 431, Juvenal of Jerusalem put forward a monstrous claim, asserting that the Bishop of Antioch, who had patriarchal rights over all the provinces of Palestine, ought himself "to be subject to the apostolic see of Jerusalem" (Bright's *Notes*, pp. 23, 24). S. Leo tells us that an attempt was made to support this claim by the production of spurious documents (cf. S. Leon. *Ep.* cxix. cap. iv., *P. L.*, liv. 1044). Some years afterwards a contest about this same claim was waged between the claimant Juvenal and Maximus of Antioch. At last the latter, weary of the controversy, agreed that the three provinces of Palestine should be released from their subjection to his see, and should constitute a new patriarchate, of which the Bishop of Jerusalem should be the head; and this arrangement was finally sanctioned by the Council of Chalcedon. It is only fair to the popes that the uncanonical aggressions of their brother patriarchs should be chronicled.

the earlier and truer teaching, which has never died out, and which we can have no doubt that God will preserve and guard in His Church unto the end.

But, in passing from the Church of the first three centuries to the Church of the fourth and subsequent centuries, we must bear in mind the great change which took place in the whole condition of the Church in consequence of the conversion of Constantine to Christianity, and all that followed therefrom. I cannot attempt to describe that change, but its magnitude can hardly be exaggerated. One may say with S. Jerome that "the Church under the Emperors was greater in power and wealth, but she was less in virtues" (*potentia et divitiis major, sed virtutibus minor*¹). Or, perhaps, still more accurately, one may say with the late Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, "In the ante-Nicene age the world had been arrayed *against* the Church; but in the next period the world worked *in* the Church; and it caused more injury to the faith [and, one may add, to Christian life] than when arrayed against it."² To put plainly what is implied in Bishop Wordsworth's statement, the world broke into the Church and established itself there, and has remained there ever since. No doubt there were all along tares mingled with the wheat. The Church of the first three centuries was never, except perhaps on the day of Pentecost, in an absolutely ideal condition. But yet, during the ages of persecution, the Church as a whole was visibly an unworldly institution. It was a spiritual empire in recognized antagonism with the world-empire. But from the time of the conversion of Constantine, A.D. 312, and still more completely from the time of Theodosius the Great (A.D. 379–A.D. 395), the Church and the world seemed, in some respects at any rate, to have made terms with each other. The world, without ceasing to be the world, was no longer *outside*, but had been admitted *within* the sacred enclosure. And that Roman world of the fourth century, what a detestable world it was! On this point Christian writers of every school seem to be agreed. The fervent and eloquent Roman Catholic, Montalembert, quotes and adopts the words of the Protestant Guizot, who says, "The sovereigns and the immense majority of the people had embraced Christianity; but at bottom civil society was pagan; it retained the institutions, the laws, and the manners of paganism. It was a society which paganism, and not Christianity, had made."³ Montalembert adds that "this

¹ *In Vita Malchi*, § 1, P. L., xxii. 53.

² *Church History*, ed. 1882, ii. 3.

³ Guizot, *Histoire de la Civilization en France*, lect. ii., quoted in Montalembert's *Monks of the West* (English trans., 1861, i. 263). See also Additional Note 56, p. 477.

paganism . . . was paganism under its most degenerate form. . . . Nothing," he says, "has ever equalled the abject condition of the Romans of the empire. . . . With the ancient freedom, all virtue, all manliness, disappeared. There remained only a society of officials, without strength, without honour, and without rights. . . . We must acknowledge that in this so-called Christian society, the moral poverty is a thousand times greater than the material, and that servitude has crushed souls more than bodies. Everything is enervated, attenuated, and decrepit. Not a single great man nor illustrious individual rises to the surface of that mire. Eunuchs and sophists of the court govern the State without control, experiencing no resistance but from the Church." These last words guard Montalembert's meaning.¹ He is speaking of *civil society* which was now nominally inside the Church; but, side by side with this Christianized paganism, the Church still handed on the glorious traditions which had been bequeathed to her by the age of the martyrs. Though it may be true that the civil society of the fourth and fifth centuries produced no great men, yet the hierarchy of the Church produced a galaxy of heroes. Let me name only five, S. Athanasius, S. Basil, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, and S. Augustine. A religious institution which can produce such splendid names is undoubtedly still full of life; but nevertheless the Church, which had admitted the world within her precincts, was in a very different condition from the Church during the first three centuries of her existence. Speaking of the great saints of the post-Nicene epoch, Montalembert says, "That long cry of grief, which echoes through all the pages which Christian writers and saints have left to us, strikes us at once with an intensity which has never been surpassed in the succession of time. They felt themselves attacked and swallowed up by pagan corruption. Listen to Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine, Salvian especially; listen to them all! They denounced the precocious decay and disgraceful downfall of the Christian people, who had become a prey to vice. They saw with despair the majority of the faithful precipitate themselves into the voluptuousness of paganism. The frightful taste for bloody or obscene spectacles, for the games of the circus, the combats of the gladiators, all the shameful frivolities, all the prostitutions of persecuting Rome, came to assail the new converts, and to subjugate the sons of the martyrs. . . . However great a margin we may leave for exaggeration in these unanimous complaints, they undoubtedly prove that the political victory of Christianity, far from having assured the definite triumph of Christian principles in the world, had

¹ Montalembert, *op. cit.*, pp. 264, 269, 271, 272.

provoked a revival of all the vices which the Christian faith ought to have annihilated." ¹

It was impossible for the effects of this decay of Christian life to be confined to the ranks of the laity. That decay necessarily also affected many of the clergy, and even of the bishops. There were, no doubt, in that age many saintly bishops, priests, and deacons. But there were also time-serving bishops, worldly bishops, courtier bishops, heretical bishops, ambitious and haughty bishops. The Emperors set the example of giving immense donations of lands and money to the churches, especially to the great churches in the principal cities of the empire; and, most of all, these gifts were lavished on the primatial church in Rome, the capital city of the civilized world. And the example of the Emperors was followed by all classes of society. The property of each church, or at any rate the income, was at the disposal of the bishop for the time being; and so it came to pass that, especially in the more important churches, the office of bishop became an object of ambition for worldly-minded men. A pagan historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, speaks of the great wealth which the Roman bishops owed to the donations of the matrons; and he says that it ought not to be wondered at, that the candidates for the Roman episcopate were ready to sacrifice everything to obtain it. The popes, he tells us, ride in chariots splendidly attired, and sit at a profuse, more than imperial, table. He goes on to say that it had been happy for them if they had followed the example of many of the bishops in the provinces, who, by their frugal and simple mode of life, commended their pure and modest virtue to the Deity and to all His true worshippers. Ammianus Marcellinus makes these remarks with special reference to the contests, and even bloodshed, which disgraced the Roman Church on the occasion of the election of Pope Damasus in A.D. 366.² Another pagan, Vettius Praetextatus, who was generally esteemed for the integrity of his life, and who occupied the high post of prefect of the city, used to say laughingly to Pope Damasus, "Make me Bishop of Rome, and I will become a Christian to-morrow." It is S. Jerome who mentions this fact.³ We have a startling proof of the worldliness which had crept into the very sanctuary of the Church, in an edict of the Emperor Valentinian I., addressed to Pope Damasus, which was publicly read in the churches of Rome. The Emperor "admonished the ecclesiastics and monks not to frequent the houses of widows and virgins;

¹ Montalembert, *op. cit.*, pp. 255, 256.

² De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire Romain au iv^e Siècle*, part. iii. i. 40.

³ *Lib. contra Joann. Jerosol.*, § 8, P. L., xxiii. 361.

and he menaced their disobedience with the animadversion of the civil judge. The director was no longer permitted to receive any gift, or legacy, or inheritance, from the liberality of his spiritual daughter; every testament contrary to this edict was declared null and void, and the illegal donation was confiscated for the use of the treasury. By a subsequent regulation, it would seem," so Gibbon tells us, "that the same provisions were extended to nuns and bishops; and that all persons of the ecclesiastical order were rendered incapable of receiving any testamentary gifts, and strictly confined to the natural and legal rights of inheritance."¹ Perhaps it will be said that this was an unfair and tyrannical enactment of the civil power. Let us, then, hear how S. Jerome comments on it. He says, in a letter to the priest Nepotianus, "The priests of idols, players, charioteers of the circus, harlots even, can freely receive legacies and donations, and it has been necessary to make a law excluding clerics and monks from this right. Who has made such a law? the persecuting Emperors? No; but Christian Emperors. I do not complain of it. I do not complain of the law, but I complain bitterly that we should have deserved it. Cautery is good; it is the wound which requires the cautery which is to be regretted. The prudent severity of the law ought to be a protection, but our avarice has not been restrained by it. We laugh at it, and evade it by setting up trustees."² S. Ambrose also refers to the law in terms, which imply that it was needed.³ I think that I have said enough to show that the nominal conversion of the empire lowered the spiritual tone of the Church at large, and of the clergy no less than of the laity; and undoubtedly it was in large cities like Rome that the poison of worldliness worked the chief harm.

No doubt, in the earlier decades of the fourth century, the bishops, who succeeded one another in the Roman see as in other great sees, had received their training during the ages of persecution; but as time went on the Church was more and more governed by bishops who had been brought up in the full sunshine of worldly prosperity. The bishops were elected by the clergy and people, and if the tone of the clergy and people gradually deteriorated, such deterioration would be sure in the end to show itself in the character of those who were chosen to fill the episcopal thrones. It is obvious that the process of deterioration would not go on

¹ See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xxv., Murray's edit., 1862, iii. 253.

² *Ep.* lii., § 6, *P. L.*, xxii. 532. Compare *S. Jerome*, by the Rev. E. L. Cutts, chap. xi.

³ S. Ambros. *Ep.* xviii. *ad Valentinianum*, § 13.

with the same rapidity in all the leading centres of Church life. Some would be more sheltered from evil influences; others would be more exposed to them. It will, I think, be well to fix our attention specially on the Church of Rome, and to consider the characters of three popes who succeeded each other in that see, occupying it during the half-century which intervened between A.D. 337 and A.D. 385. These three pontiffs were S. Julius, Liberius, and Damasus.

All that we know of Pope S. Julius, his steady support of S. Athanasius, and the friendship of that great man which he enjoyed, his letter to the Arianizing bishops of the East, his letter to the Church of Alexandria, his reputation throughout the Church in the East as well as in the West, the absence of any charges against him,—all combine to set him before us as worthy of the high position which he held.

Pope Liberius comes before us with a less satisfactory record. There must have been something noble about the man, otherwise he could never have held his ground so heroically when he withstood the Emperor Constantius to the face, and, declining all gifts of money from his persecutor, went into exile at Beroea for two years, remaining firm in the confession of his faith in the Consubstantial, and in his fellowship with S. Athanasius. It seems, moreover, quite clear that Liberius was much beloved by his flock in Rome. But afterwards, as we all know, he failed. He yearned to get back to his beloved people. He withdrew his communion from S. Athanasius and put his signature to a document which compromised the faith.¹ Cardinal Baronius, whose opinion may safely be accepted in such a matter, conjectures that his envy of the fortune of the rival pope Felix, and his longing for the adulation to which he had been used at Rome, were the Delilah that deprived this Samson of his courage and strength.² Some time after his return to Rome Liberius recovered himself, and thenceforth stood firm in his profession of the Nicene faith. But I think that Ammianus Marcellinus, who was a contemporary, implies that Liberius³ must have sanctioned and used the grandeur and luxury which he, the historian, attributes to the Roman bishops, because it was, in his opinion, the desire

¹ I have discussed the subject of Liberius' fall in Appendix G, pp. 275-287.

² Baronii *Annal.*, s.a. 357, § xli., ed. 1624, iii. 761, 762.

³ If we are to believe what S. Jerome tells us in his *Chronicon*, the clergy of the Roman Church, in the time of Liberius, were in a very unsatisfactory condition. Among the entries in the *Chronicon*, for the year 352, occurs the following statement: "When Liberius was driven into exile on account of the faith, all the members of the Roman clergy swore that they would acknowledge no other bishop. But when Felix was intruded into the episcopate by the Arians, most of the *clerici* perjured themselves" (*P. L.*, xxvii. 685, 686). These words of S. Jerome are also to be found in S. Prosper's *Chronicon* (*P. L.*, li. 578, 579).

for such things which led the two competitors for the Roman see, when it was rendered vacant by the death of Liberius, to proceed to such disgraceful extremities of tumult and bloodshed. The pontificate of Liberius coincided with a very critical time in the history of the Church, and it cannot be said that, taken as a whole, his pontificate was worthy of the exalted position which he occupied.

Damasus, the successor of Liberius, began his episcopate most unhappily. In the riots between his partisans and the supporters of his rival Ursinus, 137 persons were killed in one day, and others died afterwards of their wounds. We cannot say for certain that Damasus was responsible in whole or in part for this terrible scandal, although, according to the statement of his opponents, he led his followers on to the attack. It seems in any case clear that the slaughter was committed by his supporters, even if he in no way sanctioned it. It was surely a terrible thing to mount an episcopal throne through streams of human blood. One cannot help feeling that a saint, even if personally innocent, would have resigned all claim to the see under the circumstances. Ammianus Marcellinus divides the blame equally between the two competitors.¹ Passing on from this unhappy commencement, there can, I think, be no doubt that Damasus was accustomed to use a great deal of worldly pomp and luxury. The words of Ammianus Marcellinus and of Praetextatus have been already quoted, and their witness harmonizes with certain observations of S. Basil. That great saint, writing about a projected visit of his brother, S. Gregory Nyssen, to Rome, says, "For my part, I do not see who are to accompany him, and I know that he is entirely without experience in ecclesiastical matters; and, while he would be sure to meet with respect and to be valued by a *considerate person*, I know not what advantage could arise to the whole Church from the intercourse of such a one as he, who has no mean adulation in his nature, *with one high and lifted up*" (he, of course, means Damasus²), "*sitting on I know not how lofty a seat, and so not able to catch the voice of those who tell him the truth on the ground.*"³ S. Basil here describes Pope Damasus as a haughty, inconsiderate person, who expected to be addressed in a tone of flattery. S.

¹ Mr. Barmby (Smith and Wace, *D. C. B.*, iv. 1069), speaking of Ammianus Marcellinus, says that "though not a Christian," he "writes of the Christians in a friendly spirit, and shows no bias on the one side or the other of the contest between Damasus and Ursinus." See also Additional Note 57, p. 477.

² Tillemont (ix. 225) says, "C'est à dire visiblement avec le Pape Damase, dont S. Basile parle ici."

³ *Ep. cxxv. ad Dorotheum Presbyterum*, *Opp. S. Basil.*, ed. Ben., 1730, tom. iii. p. 323.

Jerome, speaking of the Roman clergy in the time of Damasus, paints in vivid colours the pride of the deacons, and the foppishness and avarice of some of the priests.¹ Altogether one feels that, however it may have been before, in the time of Damasus a spirit of worldliness had got hold of a large number of the Roman clergy of all orders. It is easy to see that a worldly clergy presiding over a very wealthy church, which, by the consent of all, enjoyed a primacy of honour in relation to the whole Church, which not long before had had its jurisdiction enlarged by the action of the Council of Sardica,² and even in ante-Nicene times had made unwarrantable claims, would be likely to exaggerate their own pre-eminence and to initiate a policy of aggression on other churches less favourably situated. This is exactly what happened. But before we proceed to consider that policy and the various ways in which it showed itself, it will be desirable to recall certain events which took place earlier in this fourth century, and throw light on our general subject.

In the year of our Lord 325, the first Ecumenical Council was summoned by the Emperor Constantine to meet at Nicaea. It is important that we should realize what were the relations in which S. Silvester, the Bishop of Rome, stood to that great gathering, which represented the whole Catholic Church. If S. Silvester was the infallible monarch of the Church, and was so recognized, his sovereign position ought to come out clearly in the history of the council. But, as a matter of fact, it does not appear that S. Silvester had anything to do with the convoking of the council. It was convoked by the Emperor, and there is no particle of proof that he consulted S. Silvester before convoking it.³ Nobody attributes any share in the convocation of the council to the pope until the end of the seventh century—three centuries and a half after the event. Neither is there any reason to suppose that S. Silvester presided in the council, either personally or by his legates. Eusebius, speaking of Silvester, says, "The bishop of the imperial city was absent on account of his old age, but presbyters of his were present and filled his place."⁴ These presbyters were two in number, Vincentius and Vito (or Victor), but they neither signed first nor were they the chief presidents. To use Cardinal Newman's words, "Hosius, one of the most eminent men of an age of saints, was president."⁵ Hosius was Bishop of Cordova, in Spain, and was the prelate who had the greatest influence

¹ Cf. S. Hieron. *Ep.* xxii. *ad Eustachium*, § 28, *P. L.*, xxii. 414.

² See pp. 140-144.

³ See Additional Note 58, p. 477.

⁴ *De Vit. Const.*, iii. 7.

⁵ *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, 3rd edit., 1871, p. 257.

with the Emperor, and he was probably appointed by the Emperor to preside.¹ Some Ultramontanes suppose that he presided as the chief legate of the pope; but none of the early historians speak of him as holding any such position.² Vincentius and Vito (or Victor) are the only legates whom they mention. Gelasius of Cyzicus, at the end of the fifth century, is the first to suggest the idea that Hosius was also a legate; but Gelasius' authority is of the weakest.³ We may safely say that Silvester neither convoked the council, nor presided in it by his legates,⁴ and that the council was not confirmed by him in any special way. In one sense, of course, each bishop who was absent from the council, and who accepted its decisions, confirmed it by that acceptance. But the decision of the council was enforced on the Arian heretics without anybody waiting to find out whether the pope agreed or disagreed with what had been done.⁵ If Silvester was the infallible monarch of the Church, he certainly adopted the strangest methods of asserting his infallibility and sovereign authority. He simply said nothing about either of them, but behaved just as he ought to have behaved if he was the first bishop in the Church and nothing more.

But the Council of Nicaea throws light in other ways on the position of the Roman see. In the sixth canon there is a reference to the Church of Rome. In that canon the council decreed as follows: "Let the ancient customs prevail, namely, those in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis: that the Bishop of Alexandria have power over all these, since the same is customary for the Bishop of Rome. Likewise, in Antioch and other provinces, that the privileges be secured to the churches,"⁶ etc. This canon ratifies the ancient custom that the Bishop of Alexandria should retain his fulness of jurisdiction over

¹ Even the Ultramontane Ballerini consider that it is most probable that it was by the Emperor's orders that Marinus of Arles presided at the Council of Arles in A.D. 314 (cf. Ballerini, *Obs. in Dissert. v. Quesnell.*, pars ii. cap. v. § 4, *P. L.*, lv. 608). See also Additional Note 59, p. 480.

² *E.g.* Eusebius, Theodoret, Socrates, and Sozomen.

³ Cardinal Newman (*Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, p. 84) says, "Gelasius est auctoritate tenui." Mr. Venables says that "his work is little more than a compilation from the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, to which he has added little but what is very doubtful or manifestly untrue" (see Smith and Wace, *D. C. B.*, s.v. "Gelasius" [13], ii. 622). Compare Mansi, ii. 753; Coleti, ii. 111, 112; and Tillemont, vi. 675.

⁴ See Appendix D, pp. 166-172.

⁵ See Bossuet's *Defensio*, pars iii. lib. vii. cap. vii. Bossuet says concerning the dogmatic decree of the Nicene Council, "Facto Patrum decreto, adeo res transacta putabatur, ut nullâ morâ interpositâ, nullo expectato sedis apostolicæ speciali decreto, omnes ubique terrarum episcopi, Christiani omnes, atque ipse imperator, ipsi etiam Ariani, tamquam divino iudicio cederent."

⁶ On the spurious addition to this canon, in which it is said that the Roman Church always had the primacy, see p. 382, and also the Additional Note 60, p. 480.

the various provinces of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. That jurisdiction was far-reaching, as I observed in a previous lecture. But the canon goes on to cite the case of the Roman see as parallel to the case of the Alexandrine see. It says, "since the same is customary for the Bishop of Rome." Rufinus, explaining this sixth Nicene canon, mentions that Rome had the care of the suburbicarian churches,¹ as Alexandria had of the Egyptian and Libyan churches. Rufinus' statement about the pope's sphere of jurisdiction no doubt expressed accurately the state of things in his own time (*circa* 400), but in the time of the Council of Nicaea the metropolitan jurisdiction of the see of Rome extended over the whole of Italy. However, the point to be noticed is that the council says not a word about any Roman primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church. It puts side by side the privileges of the second see and the privileges of the first see. The bishops of both sees were powerful bishops—powerful metropolitans—if you will, powerful patriarchs, though it is practically certain that in the Nicene age the Bishop of Rome was not, strictly speaking, a patriarch with subject metropolitans.² But whatever they were, the nature of their authority was substantially the same. The canon perhaps implies a certain primacy in Rome, because it proposes Rome as, in a sort of way, the model; but if a primacy is implied, it is obviously a primacy of honour, not a universal supremacy of jurisdiction. If that had been thought of, it would have been safeguarded. Moreover, if that had been thought of, Rome would hardly have been mentioned as a precedent for the limited jurisdiction of Alexandria. If you are discussing the privileges of this or that peer, you are hardly likely to illustrate your argument by referring to the prerogative of the king.

But again the Council of Nicaea throws light on the question whether the see of Rome had a primacy of jurisdiction over all churches, by its decree in regard to appeals. The fifth canon allows persons who think that they have been unjustly excommunicated by their bishop to complain to the provincial synod, and the synod is to determine whether the

¹ Cf. Rufin. *H. E.*, i. 6, *P. L.*, xxi. 473. In a certain ancient Latin version of the canons of Nicaea, published by Maassen, the first sentence of the sixth canon runs thus: "Antiqua per Aegyptum adque Pentapolim consuetudo servetur, ut Alexandrinus episcopus horum habeat sollicitudinem, quoniam et urbis Romae episcopo similis mos est, ut in suburbicaria loca sollicitudinem gerat" (cf. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des Canonischen Rechts*, p. 905). This version was in use at Carthage in the fifth century, and has been attributed to Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage, who was present at Nicaea; but for my own part I doubt if the version is earlier than the pontificate of Damasus (compare p. 434).

² Cf. Tillemont, x. 790; and Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 30.

complaint is a just one, and to make some decree in accordance with its determination. Not a word is said about any appeal from the decision of the provincial synod, either to some greater synod, or to a patriarch, or to Rome. The provincial synod is set forth as the final authority for each province. Now, the Vatican Council decrees that because the Roman pontiff presides over the universal Church *by the divine right* of his apostolic primacy, *therefore* "he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and recourse may be had to his judgement in all causes which pertain to the jurisdiction of the Church." Why did not the Council of Nicaea safeguard this divine right of its infallible monarch? Is it not marvellous that on the very first occasion, when the whole Church has an opportunity of meeting together by representation in an Ecumenical Synod, the one matter, in which it seems to take no interest, is the divinely-given prerogatives of its head? If it alludes to the Roman see in a casual way in its sixth canon, it is only to speak of its local rights as the metropolitan see of Italy. Concerning any general powers belonging to Rome as the court of appeal for the whole Catholic Church, it preserves an absolute and, I must add, a significant silence. It is silent, not because it consciously repudiates the idea of Rome being such a court of appeal, but because the idea had not crossed the minds of the Saints and Fathers who composed the council. I cannot doubt that, if the idea had been presented to the synod, and if any claim on behalf of the pope had been urged as a matter of divine right, a repudiation of such claim would have been made in unmistakable terms. But, as a matter of fact, the claim was not made, and therefore the whole conception which underlies the Vatican decrees was ignored. From whatever point of view we regard that wonderful assembly, the first Ecumenical Council, we find in it a perpetual witness against the theory that modern papalism has any foothold in primitive tradition and practice. The Nicene Council set the seal of its ecumenical approval on that system of Church government which was in use during the first three centuries, and for which the Church of England contends at the present day.

We now pass from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Sardica (the modern Sophia), which was held eighteen years later, in A.D. 343. This council is of very great importance in its bearing on our subject, because it really did give to the pope a certain measure of jurisdiction outside the limits of the churches of Italy. The council was intended to be an Ecumenical Council, and when it passed the canons to which I am alluding, it intended to give to the pope the right of receiving appeals from all parts of the Church, from the East

no less than from the West. As things turned out, the council was not accepted by the Church as ecumenical, and at the present day no one attributes to it that character.¹ Almost all the Eastern bishops, who had been summoned, withdrew in a body, and the council, as it was actually held, consisted of about ninety-five Western bishops and only six Easterns. Some of its acts were, within a very few years, accepted by a considerable portion of the Church, as, for example, its declaration that S. Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepas of Gaza were innocent of the charges brought against them; and also its deposition and excommunication of the principal revivers of Arianism; but the disciplinary canons passed by the council were not received in the East until the end of the seventh century, and even then many of their provisions were considered as applying only to the churches of the West.² But even in the West itself the canons were by no means universally received. In Africa, for example, they were not known in the earlier part of the fifth century. However, although these canons were by no means universally accepted, they are of very great importance in the history of the growth of the papal power. During the years which had elapsed since the Council of Nicaea, there had been a great deal of confusion in the Church. As we have seen, the Council of Nicaea decreed that the affairs of each province should be administered by the synod of that province; no provision was made for any appeal to a higher authority than the provincial synod. But, as a matter of fact, appeals had from time to time been made to the Emperors, and they had committed the hearing of some of those appeals to such synods as they chose to convoke. Much trouble had arisen in consequence. The great S. Athanasius had been condemned on the most frivolous grounds by a Synod of Tyre, which had no sort of jurisdiction over him, except what it got from the Emperor, and twice he had been banished from his see by the imperial authority. He had been supported by Pope S. Julius of Rome, who had recognized the ecclesiastical nullity of the proceedings of his opponents, and the futility of the charges made against him, and had granted to him the communion of the Church of Rome. In fact, during all these eighteen years the Church of Rome had played a very good part. It had maintained loyally the Catholic faith as defined at Nicaea,³ and it had supported the orthodox bishops who were suffering

¹ Natalis Alexander, in the seventeenth century, argued in favour of the ecumenicity of the Sardican Council, but his assertion was condemned by the Roman censors (see Hefele's *History of the Church Councils*, vol. ii. p. 176, English trans.).

² See the note on pp. 143, 144.

³ But see Additional Note 61, p. 480.

persecution at the hands of the Arianizing Emperors and of the Arianizing cabal of Eastern bishops who looked to Eusebius of Nicomedia as their ringleader. When compared with the confusion which reigned in the East, Rome and the West seemed a quiet haven of refuge. We need not wonder that a great Western council, such as the Council of Sardica was, should think that the time had come for providing some canonical method of appeal from the decisions of provincial councils, that should take the place of the uncanonical appeals to the Emperor, which had become frequent. And what could be more natural than to substitute an appeal to the Bishop of Rome, who enjoyed a primacy of honour which was recognized by the whole Church? Not that the Council of Sardica intended that the Bishop of Rome should personally hear the appeal, but they proposed that, if, on being appealed to, he thought that a rehearing ought to be granted, he should have the right to appoint bishops who should hear the appeal. The council only proposed to grant this right of appeal to Rome in the case of a *bishop*, who should have been deposed by the synod of the province to which he belonged; and part of their arrangement was that, if the pope chose to grant a rehearing and to appoint judges, he should be bound to nominate bishops from the neighbourhood of the province in which the case had arisen; although he was also to have the power, if he chose to use it, of sending legates of his own to assist in the proceedings of the court of appeal. There was no thought of giving to the pope any right of evoking the cause to Rome. The appeal was to be heard out in the provinces, in the neighbourhood of the place where the cause had arisen.¹ Such were the main provisions of the famous canons of Sardica,² which conferred an appellate jurisdiction of a strictly limited kind on the Roman pope. Before discussing the light which they throw on our general subject, it will be well to quote some of the clauses of one of these canons. In the third canon, "Hosius the bishop said . . . If any of the bishops shall have been condemned in any matter, and thinks that he has right on his side, and wishes that a new council should be convoked; if it please you, let us honour the memory of S. Peter the apostle, and let the bishops who have judged the case [in the provincial synod] write to Julius, the Roman bishop, and if he shall determine in favour of a new trial, let there be a new trial, and let him appoint judges," etc. It seems most strange that Roman Catholics should refer with any pleasure to these canons of

¹ See Additional Note 62, p. 481.

² According to Hefele's numbering, they are the third, fourth, and fifth canons.

Sardica. According to the view laid down by the Vatican Council, the supremacy of the pope belongs to him *jure divino*, and as a consequence of that supremacy every member of the Church, whether he belongs to the clergy or to the laity, has an inherent right of appealing to his judgement in any matter appertaining to the jurisdiction of the Church. But here we have the Fathers of the Council of Sardica carrying a resolution, so to speak, in favour of the Roman see, and determining that, in honour of the memory of S. Peter, they will in certain rare cases give to the pope a very restricted right of determining whether there shall be a rehearing, and of appointing bishops who shall form the court of appeal, and of deputing one or more legates to sit with them in that court.¹ And all this is proposed by Bishop Hosius tentatively—"si vobis placet"—"if it please you." On the papalist theory, the whole proceeding must appear insufferably impertinent. It did not so appear to S. Athanasius and to the other Fathers of the synod, because they knew nothing of the theory which underlies the Vatican decrees. They thought that they were conferring an extraordinary privilege on the Roman see, by giving to it a certain measure of jurisdiction outside its own Italian domain, and that they were thus honouring the memory of S. Peter, whose successor Julius was reputed to be, and in some sense was. So they thought, and they were quite right. The new privilege which they then conferred was extraordinary.² Their intention was to add to the primacy of honour which the see of Rome already possessed, a primacy of jurisdiction—of *limited* jurisdiction, no doubt, but still a primacy of jurisdiction, and one which should affect the whole Church. They failed in carrying out their full design, because these canons were never received in the East in such sense as to be applicable, without radical modification, to the East ;³ and they were only received in certain

¹ Papal legates, sent by the pope to take part in a synod held outside the sphere of his metropolitan jurisdiction, would not of necessity preside. At the great Council of Carthage held in May, 419, three papal legates were present, namely, a bishop and two Roman priests. But S. Aurelius of Carthage presided, Faustinus the episcopal legate sitting third, and the two priest-legates sitting last. There were 217 bishops present at the council.

² Archbishop De Marca of Paris (*De Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, VII. iii. 8) rightly says, "The words of the canon prove that the institution of this right was *new*. 'If it please you,' says Hosius of Cordova, the president of the council, 'let us honour the memory of S. Peter the apostle.' He says not that the ancient tradition was to be confirmed, as was wont to be done in matters which only require the renewal or explanation of an ancient right." Compare also Dr. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 88, n. 1.

³ The Sardican canons were included in the collection of John Scholasticus, the schismatic Patriarch of Constantinople, who was intruded by Justinian into the place of S. Eutychius ; and they received a certain recognition at the Trullan Council, along with other documents, more or less inconsistent with them, as, for example, the canons and letters of the Councils of Carthage in the time of S.

parts of the West. But in whatever Western provinces they were received, they had the effect of aggregating those provinces for certain purposes to what may now be called the Roman patriarchate. The ultimate effect of these canons was to revolutionize the whole theory and practice of ecclesiastical government, at any rate within the Latin portion of the Church. For here we have the first beginning of that which, in the course of ages, was enlarged by accretion and successful usurpation into that plenitude of power which, wherever it is acknowledged, makes the Church to be the bond-servant of the pope.

Having thus considered the two great Councils of Nicaea (A.D. 325) and Sardica (A.D. 343) in their bearing on our general subject, we are in a position to revert to the pontificate of Damasus, who occupied the Roman chair from A.D. 366 to A.D. 384. I have already implied several times that this pontificate constitutes a fresh starting-point in the history of the growth of the papal claims. It was during the episcopate of Damasus that a worldly spirit became very marked among many of the members of the clergy of the Roman Church. It was also during his time that, by legislative action on the part of the Emperors, a certain measure of coactive jurisdiction was conferred by the State upon the popes.

My limits will not allow me to treat this branch of the subject in much detail, but I propose to illustrate my statement by reference to two imperial constitutions, one spontaneously promulgated by Valentinian I. at some date between 367 and 372, and the other promulgated by Gratian,¹ in response to the petition of a synod of bishops gathered from various parts of Italy, and held at Rome under the

Aurelius, which expressly rejected the Sardican system of appeals. The later Greek canonists, finding them in some way sanctioned by the Trullan Council, interpret the canons which deal with the appeal to Rome as applying, in the letter, only to the churches of the West. They hold that, so far as they are applicable to the East, the appeal is to the see of Constantinople, which is new Rome (cf. Beveridge's *Synodicon*, i. 486, 489). But, when we pass from the theories of canonists to the actual practice of the Church, we find that the Sardican discipline about appeals was never carried out in the East. The Councils of Antioch, Constantinople, and Chalcedon, had worked out a totally different scheme of appeals, in which the pope does not appear at all. And the real fact is that it is very difficult to discover much trace of the actual carrying out of the Sardican system, even in the West, before the ninth century. Compare De Marca's *De Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, lib. vii. capp. iv. et seqq. On the whole subject of the acceptance of the canons of Sardica in the East, see Appendix E, pp. 172-177.

¹ Gratian's law is embodied in the rescript to Aquilinus, which begins with the words *Ordinariorum sententiae*. It will be found in Migne's *P. L.* (xiii. 583, sqq.). Critical editions have been published by Meyer and Günther. The petition of the synod of 382 begins with the words, *Et hoc gloriae vestrae*. It will be found in *P. L.* (xiii. 575, sqq.).

presidency of Damasus, towards the end of May or in June, 382.¹ Valentinian's constitution has unfortunately not come down to us, but it seems clear that its provisions have been summarized in the petition of the synod of 382. That synod declares over and over again that it is not asking for anything new, but only that the old law should be put in force,² and it implies that Gratian had in some way had a share in the enacting of that old law. As Gratian was made joint-emperor with his father, Valentinian, in 367, his name no doubt appeared along with his father's in the inscription of the law, so that, although his share in the making of the law was purely nominal, for he was a mere child when it was enacted, yet legally he was as much the author of the law as Valentinian was.

The synod of 382, following no doubt the provisions of the earlier law of Valentinian, petitioned Gratian³ to give

¹ Pagi, Tillemont, Mansi, and others assign this Roman synod to the year 378. Merenda, Hefele, and Duchesne assign it to the year 380. In an *Excursus* on the date of this synod, to be found on pp. 510-528 of this volume, I have given reasons for thinking that the true date is the year 382. So far as my general argument is concerned, I am quite indifferent as to which of these dates is finally adopted.

² In § 1 of its petition (*P. L.*, xiii. 576, 577) the synod, addressing the two Western Emperors, Gratian and Valentinian II., says, "When we were considering what request it would be desirable to make to you on behalf of the churches, we were not able to hit upon anything better than that which you in your spontaneous forethought have already bestowed. We see that neither ought there to be any shame in asking, nor ought there to be any need for us to obtain by petition, favours which you have already granted. We see also that a series of imperial decrees plead on our behalf. For, as regards the equity of our petition, we succeeded long ago in obtaining the things which we are requesting; but as regards the need of renewing our prayer, we have so entirely failed in obtaining the effect of the favours granted, that we desire to have them granted afresh." In § 4 (col. 579) the synod says, "Idcirco statuti imperialis non novitatem sed firmitudinem postulamus."

³ For the convenience of the reader, I place side by side in this note those portions of the synodical petition and of Gratian's rescript, which deal with the subject of the trial of accused Western bishops, and with their rights of appeal. The text of the extract from the synodical petition is Migne's (*P. L.*, xiii. 581). The text of the quotation from the rescript is taken, with one obvious correction, from Günther's Vienna edition of the *Collectio Avellana* (*Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.*, vol. xxxv. pars i. pp. 57, 58).

Extract from the Petition of the Roman Synod of 382.

"Quaesumus clementiam vestram, ne rursus in plurimis causis videamur onerosi, ut jubere pietas vestra dignetur, quicumque vel ejus [sc. Damasi], vel nostro judicio, qui catholici sumus, fuerit condemnatus, atque injuste voluerit ecclesiam retinere, vel vocatus a sacerdotali judicio per contumaciam non adesse, seu ab illustribus viris praefectis praetorio Italiae vestrae,

Extract from Gratian's Rescript.

"Volumus autem, ut, quicumque judicio Damasi, quod ille cum concilio quinque vel septem habuerit episcoporum, vel eorum qui catholici sint judicio atque concilio condemnatus erit, si injuste voluerit ecclesiam retentare vel evocatus ad sacerdotale judicium per contumaciam non <ad> esse, seu ab illustribus viris praefectis praetorio Galliae atque Italiae auctoritate adhibita ad episcopale judicium remittatur

orders that, if any bishop, after being condemned either by Damasus' judgement or by the judgement of other Catholic bishops, should wish wrongly to keep possession of his bishopric, or if, when cited to be tried by his brethren, he should contumaciously refuse to come, he should be summoned to Rome either by the prefects of the praetorium of Italy, or by the vicarius of the city of Rome, and should be compelled to obey the summons; or, if a case of this sort should arise in the more distant parts, that it should be committed to the examination of the metropolitan by the local courts of justice; or, if the metropolitan should himself be the accused party, that he should be ordered to go without delay to Rome, or to such judges as the Bishop of Rome might appoint. The synod of 382 further asked that, if the condemned bishop should for any reason doubt the fairness of his metropolitan, or of any other of his episcopal judges, he should have the right to appeal to the Bishop of Rome, or to a synod of at least fifteen of the bishops of his neighbourhood. The petition of the synod of 382 touched on many other matters, but there seems to be no need to confuse the reader by referring to any of them at present.

The Emperor Gratian substantially granted the various points, which were thus brought before him by the petitioning synod, and have been summarized above. He amended, however, the scheme set forth by the synod in two particulars; or it may perhaps be truer to say that, in regard to one of these points, he elucidated what was in the synod's mind by giving fuller details, and that it was in regard to the

sive a vicario accitus ad urbem Romam veniat: aut si in longinquiribus partibus hujusmodi emerit quaestio, ad metropolitani per locorum iudicia deducatur examen: vel si ipse metropolitanus est, Romam necessario, vel ad eos quos Romanus episcopus iudices dederit, contendere sine dilatione iubeatur: ita ut qui depositi fuerint, ab ejus tantum civitatis finibus segregentur, in qua gesserint sacerdotium, ne rursus impudenter usurpent quod jure sublatum sit. Certe si vel metropolitani, vel cujusce alterius sacerdotis suspecta gratia vel iniquitas fuerit, vel ad Romanum episcopum, vel ad concilium certe quindecim episcoporum finitimorum ei liceat provocare."

sive a proconsulibus vel vicariis <accitus> ad urbem Romam sub prosecutione perveniat, aut si in longinquiribus partibus alicujus ferocitas talis emerit, omnis ejus causae dictio ad metropolitani in eadem provincia episcopi deducatur examen, vel, si ipse metropolitanus est, Romam necessario vel ad eos quos Romanus episcopus iudices dederit, sine dilatione [the Vienna edition has a misprint—*relatione*] contendat, ita tamen ut, quicumque dejecti sunt, ab ejus tantum urbis finibus segregentur, in quibus fuerint sacerdotes. Mitius enim graviter meritos cohercemus et sacrilegam pertinaciam lenius quam merentur ulciscimur. Quod si vel metropolitani episcopi vel cujuscumque alterius sacerdotis iniquitas suspectatur aut gratia, ad Romanum episcopum vel ad concilium quindecim finitimorum episcoporum arcessito liceat provocare, modo ne post examen habitum, quod definitum fuerit, integretur."

other point only that he introduced a correction. The synod had spoken of bishops condemned by Damasus' judgement. The Emperor, either correcting or elucidating,¹ requires that five or seven bishops shall have been acting with Damasus, if a condemnation at Rome is to be treated as valid by the imperial authorities. As regards the other point, the synod, when dealing with the case of bishops living in the nearer regions, who should have been condemned, not at Rome, but by the judgement of Catholic bishops away from Rome, asks that if the condemned bishop contumaciously ignores the judgement passed upon him, or refuses to obey the citation of the ecclesiastical court, he shall be compelled to go to Rome.² Here the Emperor corrects the scheme proposed by the bishops. He implies very clearly that these recalcitrant bishops are to be compelled to present themselves before the episcopal tribunal, the authority of which they have slighted, wherever that tribunal might hold its sittings.³

A very slight inspection of the petition of the synod and of Gratian's rescript, which was issued in response to that petition, will show that a great distinction was made both by the synod and by the Emperor between the bishops who lived in the nearer regions, and the bishops who lived in the more distant regions. To me it seems clear that we are to understand, by the nearer regions, the suburbicarian dioceses, which were governed by the comprovincials of the Roman bishop. The more distant regions would include the whole of the rest of the Western empire.⁴ Neither in the petition nor in the rescript is any mention made of metropolitans in connexion with the nearer regions. Bishops in those regions are to be tried, in the first instance, either at Rome or by a synod of

¹ It seems to me quite probable that the Emperor is merely stating explicitly details about the ecclesiastical tribunal at Rome, which the synod passed over in silence, because it took them for granted. The Emperor himself, when speaking further on of bishops appealing from the sentence of the court of their metropolitan to the Roman bishop, says nothing of any other bishops being conjoined with their Roman brother to form a court; but it is obvious that, if the Roman patriarch could not act alone as a court of first instance, much less could he act alone in a case of appeal.

² It was quite natural for the synod to ask that all these recalcitrant bishops should be compelled to go to Rome, because, as will be seen further on, they are dealing at this stage of their petition with bishops who were, all of them, suffragans of the Roman province.

³ Gratian says, "Seu . . . ad episcopale iudicium remittatur, sive . . . ad urbem Romam sub prosecutione perveniat." (See the quotation from the rescript, printed in note 3 on pp. 145, 146.)

⁴ In the first two editions of this book I upheld the view that the rules for the trial of bishops, contained in Gratian's rescript, applied to the bishops of the whole Western empire, but that the similar rules in Valentinian's earlier law, which appear also in the Roman petition, applied only to the bishops of Italy and Illyricum. I have explained in the Additional Note 66 (pp. 487, 488) why I have abandoned the opinion which I formerly maintained in regard to the limited scope of Valentinian's law.

Catholic bishops assembled elsewhere. But in the more distant regions bishops under accusation are to be remitted by the local magistrates to the court of the metropolitan. Now, in the suburbicarian regions, during the fourth and fifth centuries, there do not appear to have been any metropolitans. Throughout those regions the Bishop of Rome, and he alone, exercised metropolitical jurisdiction.¹ Yet in Sicily certainly,² and very probably also in Sardinia and Corsica, all of which were suburbicarian, local synods were held. Even as late as the time of S. Gregory the Great (590-604) there was no metropolitan in Sicily,³ though Sicilian synods were convoked every year.⁴ But outside the suburbicarian regions there were metropolitans in some provinces, and in other provinces the senior bishop acted as quasi-metropolitan. Thus in the province of Proconsular Africa the Bishop of Carthage was metropolitan. In North Italy, during the time when Gratian was the acting Emperor of the West, S. Ambrose of Milan was metropolitan; and even earlier, when Valentinian I. spontaneously promulgated the constitution, which Gratian revived in 382, there is good reason to think that Auxentius, the predecessor of S. Ambrose, was recognized by the Emperor as metropolitan.⁵ In the north-east corner of Italy, that is to say in Eastern Venetia

¹ It is true that Ravenna was raised to metropolitical rank, no doubt by the combined action of the Emperor and the Roman pope, either during the episcopate of John Angeloptes, that is to say, between 430 and 433—a view which seems to be confirmed by a passage in the 112th epistle of Theodoret—or during the episcopate of S. Peter Chrysologus, that is to say, between 433 and 449, as seems to be implied in the 175th sermon of Chrysologus. But, although Ravenna was itself a suburbicarian see, the suffragan sees of its newly-formed province were, all of them, outside the northern boundary of the suburbicarian circumscription. Duchesne (*Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 2^{de} edit., p. 30) says, “Le pape demeura le seul métropolitain réel de l’Italie péninsulaire et des îles.”

² Cf. S. Athan. *Ep. ad Afros*, § 1, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1777, i. 712; and Socrat. *H. E.*, iv. 12.

³ Cf. S. Greg. Magn. *Registr.*, lib. ii. ep. vii., *P. L.*, lxxvii. 543, 544.

⁴ Cf. S. Greg. Magn. *Registr.*, lib. i. ep. i., *P. L.*, lxxvii. 443. In Sardinia, in S. Gregory’s time, Caralis (or Calaris) had already become a metropolitical see (cf. S. Greg. Magn. *Registr.*, lib. i. ep. xlix., and lib. iv. ep. ix., *P. L.*, lxxvii. 512, 676). In the second of these letters S. Gregory directs the metropolitan, Januarius, to convoke the bishops of his province to a synod twice a year, in accordance with the canons and with the local custom.

⁵ Bacchinus (*De Eccl. Hierarch. Origin. Dissert.*, edit. 1703, pars 2^{da}, pp. 346, 347), after showing that there is no reason for thinking that S. Dionysius of Milan (352-355) was a metropolitan, says, “Auxentio Ariano Mediolanensi sedi incubante, late haeresis virus per Italiam, dioecesim videlicet Vicarii Italiae, serpit, et circumpositos episcopos a Catholica Romanae communionis avulsos, occasione data, et suos pseudo-conventus celebrasse, et ab Auxentio ordinatos fuisse, verisimillimum, immo pene certum sit.” There is no trace of Milan having been erected into a metropolitical see on the accession of S. Ambrose. He seems to have inherited his metropolitical jurisdiction; and he could not have done this if the metropolitical status of the see had not been previously recognized by the Emperor and by the Bishops of Rome, who had originally been metropolitans over all Italy. Compare p. 434.

and Histria, and perhaps in some of the neighbouring provinces of Western Illyricum, it is highly probable that during the whole of this period the Bishop of Aquileia was exercising metropolitan jurisdiction.¹

In Spain there is positive proof of the existence of metropolitans in the year 385,² and as no hint is given that the system of metropolitans was of recent introduction, one may well suppose that the establishment of that system preceded the rescript of Gratian, and possibly even the constitution of Valentinian I. Five provinces were included in the European portion of the civil diocese of Spain, namely, Baetica, Carthaginensis, Tarraconensis, Lusitania, and Gallaecia. It is probable that in 385, and for some time previously, the bishops of each of these provinces had been headed by a metropolitan. The province of Mauritania Tingitana belonged also to the civil diocese of Spain, but ecclesiastically it seems to have formed part of the African province of Mauritania Caesariensis.

Passing from Spain to Gaul, we find that at the time when the Council of Turin was held, that is to say in the year 398 or thereabouts, Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, was in the habit of consecrating all the bishops of the province of Narbonensis Secunda. Mgr. Duchesne thinks that the metropolitan or quasi-metropolitan status of the see of Marseilles was by no means of recent institution, but that it must be traced back to the fact that the Church of Marseilles was the mother-church of Narbonensian Gaul, and that in particular the churches of Narbonensis Secunda had been founded by missionaries sent forth directly from the mother-church. Outside of Narbonensis Secunda and the immediate surroundings and dependencies of Marseilles, there does not appear to be any trace of metropolitan organization in any part of Gaul until about the year 398. Similarly in Britain³ and in Western Illyricum⁴ there seem to have been no metropolitans.

In provinces, which were not subject to any metropolitan, it is probable that a certain right of initiative was vested in the senior bishop of the province.⁵ He would convoke

¹ For evidence tending to show that the see of Aquileia had metropolitan status during the larger part of the second half of the fourth century, see the Additional Note 63, p. 481.

² See the Additional Note 64, p. 485.

³ Compare Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Eccl. Documents*, i. 142; and Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 2^de edit., p. 31.

⁴ One must except those parts of Western Illyricum, if there were any, which may have been included in the province of Aquileia.

⁵ Duchesne (*Fastes Episcopaux*, i. 115) says, "Il faut se rappeler que la préséance du doyen [*i.e.* the senior bishop] paraît bien avoir été, en Gaule comme

councils and preside over them; and in particular cases fuller powers may have been conceded to him. Such was eminently the case in all the North African provinces, except the *Proconsularis*. That province alone had, as we have seen, a real metropolitan, namely the Primate of Carthage. In the other provinces, subject to the Carthaginian primacy, the senior bishop had well-defined powers.

Thus it would seem that, during the pontificate of Damasus, when the two previously mentioned imperial constitutions, regulating the trial of bishops, were enacted, the first by Valentinian and the second by Gratian, there were metropolitans established at Milan, and in all probability also at Aquileia in North Italy, at Marseilles in the south-eastern corner of Gaul, at Carthage in Africa, and at Tarraco and four other cities in Spain.¹ It would therefore appear that, when the Roman synod of 382 in its petition, and the Emperor Gratian in his rescript, spoke of the *longinquoires partes*, they certainly included under that category Africa, Spain, North Italy, and that portion of Gaul which borders on North Italy. It follows that the nearer regions must be identified with the suburbicarian provinces, which were immediately subject to the metropolitan jurisdiction of the Roman see. This result is confirmed by the fact that the Roman synod, when dealing with the nearer regions, asks that the law may be enforced either by the Prefects of the praetorium of Italy or by the Vicarius, that is the *Vicarius Urbis*.² If the nearer regions had extended beyond the

ailleurs, la plus ancienne forme de l'autorité au sein du corps épiscopal. Les doyens sont antérieurs aux métropolitains."

¹ Whether the metropolitan system was established in Spain so early as the date of the publication of the constitution of Valentinian may perhaps be doubted. I cannot prove that it was not established by that time.

² In order that the reader may be in a position to understand more clearly both the synodical petition and the rescript of Gratian, I think it well to set forth in this note the greater divisions into which, for purposes of civil administration, the Western Empire was apportioned during the reigns of Valentinian I. and Gratian (A.D. 364-383). Strictly speaking, there were in the West, during the greater part of the period with which we are dealing, three praetorian prefectures, namely, (1) the prefecture of Italy, (2) the prefecture of Eastern Illyricum, and (3) the prefecture of the Gauls. But though there were for the most part three prefectures, there were from 364 to the end of 381 only two prefects, viz. the praetorian Prefect of Italy and the praetorian Prefect of the Gauls. For from 362 to January 379, the Prefect of the praetorium of Italy administered the two prefectures of Italy and Eastern Illyricum; and after the division of the empire between Gratian and Theodosius in 379, the prefecture of Eastern Illyricum fell to the share of the Eastern Emperor, and therefore ceased to pertain to the West. Subordinate to the Italian Prefecture were the diocese of Western Illyricum, the vicariate of Italy (that is, of Northern Italy), the vicariate of Rome (that is, in other words, the suburbicarian provinces), and the diocese of Africa. Subordinate to the prefecture of Eastern Illyricum, which, as we have seen, was in fact administered by the Prefect of Italy, were the diocese of Dacia and the diocese of Macedonia. Subordinate to the prefecture of the Gauls were the diocese of Britain, the diocese of the Gauls (that is, Northern Gaul), the diocese

suburbicarian provinces, it can hardly be doubted that other officials, such as the *Vicarius Italiae* or the *Vicarius Africae*, would have been mentioned.

The next point which presents itself for consideration relates to the question—how far the jurisdiction of the Roman see was enlarged by these legislative acts of Valentinian and Gratian. It does not appear that the power of the pope was in any way enlarged in the matter of summoning ordinary bishops to Rome to be tried there in a court of first instance. He no doubt possessed that power throughout the suburbicarian vicariate before the time of Valentinian, and the new laws did not extend the area in which that power could be exercised.

But these new laws did give to the pope two new powers which he certainly did not possess before. For in the first place, the pope was made master of the judicial process by which all accused metropolitans throughout the West were to be tried. He might either have them summoned to Rome to be tried there, or he might appoint judges before whom they would have to be tried elsewhere. And in the second place, ordinary bishops throughout the Western Empire, who had been tried in the first instance away from Rome by the provincial synod or by some local synod of bishops, might, if they chose, appeal either to the pope or to a synod of fifteen bishops having sees in their neighbourhood.

These powers were new ;¹ for before the erection of Milan into a metropolitanical see, which was certainly later than the Council of Sardica, there was only one fully recognized metropolitan in the whole West besides the pope, and that was the Primate of Carthage ;² and it is quite certain that the African

of the Five Provinces (that is, Southern Gaul), and the diocese of Spain. Some of these divisions were administered directly by the prefects, others were administered by the vicars of the prefects. Thus there was a Vicar of Italy, a Vicar of Rome, a Vicar of Africa, a Vicar of Macedonia, a Vicar of Britain, and a Vicar of the Five Provinces. The province of Proconsular Africa was administered by the Proconsul of Africa, who was directly responsible to the Emperor ; and similarly the diocese of Spain was, as it would seem, administered from about 370 to 383 by the Proconsul of Spain, but previously by a vicar. Thus in the West there were, from about 370 to 379, besides the prefects, six vicars and two proconsuls. From 379 to 383 there were five vicars and two proconsuls. Early in 383 the Spanish proconsulate was abolished, and the diocese of Spain was once more administered by a vicar. After that there were in the West, besides the prefects, six vicars and one proconsul. I have discussed questions connected with the civil administration of Spain in the Additional Note 65, p. 485 ; and I have shown elsewhere (see pp. 525-527) that between 382 and 386, both inclusive, the Italian prefecture was administered by two joint-prefects acting together *collegialiter*.

¹ I except from this statement the right of appeal to the pope from local synods in Sicily and Sardinia, and other places within the suburbicarian vicariate.

² The authority of Marseilles over its daughter-churches involved a right to consecrate their bishops ; but we have no proof that the Bishop of Marseilles claimed full metropolitanical jurisdiction before the end of the fourth century, when

Church did not recognize any inherent right in the pope of trying the Bishop of Carthage. When in 312 the synod of seventy Numidian bishops, under the presidency of the Primate of Numidia, Secundus of Tigisis, deposed Caecilian of Carthage, and so began the Donatist schism, no one either then or during the whole of the subsequent controversy brought it as a charge against those bishops that they were usurping the functions of the pope, in having taken upon themselves to try to condemn a metropolitan. The pope himself, so far as we know, never made any such claim; and S. Miltiades must have made the claim, if it had been a just one, when the whole matter was referred by Constantine to himself and eighteen other bishops, who met in council at Rome in the year 313. If the pope had really had an exclusive right of trying Caecilian, either in person or by judges commissioned by him, how could S. Augustine, addressing the Donatists, have written as he does in his letter to Glorius, Eleusius, and others? In that letter he says, "Perhaps you will say that Miltiades, the Bishop of the Roman Church, along with the other bishops beyond the sea, who acted as his colleagues, had no right to usurp the place of judge in a matter which had been already terminated by seventy African bishops at a council, in which the Primate-bishop of Tigisis presided. But what will you say, if Miltiades, in fact, did not usurp this place? For the Emperor, having been petitioned [by the Donatists], sent bishops to sit with him as judges, with authority to decide the whole matter in the way which seemed to them just."¹ Evidently it had never occurred to S. Augustine that Miltiades, as Bishop of Rome, had an inherent right to try Caecilian, as

the metropolitan system was being introduced into Gaul; nor have we any reason to think that the other provinces of Gaul yielded any precedence to Marseilles as being a metropolitan see. When in the fifth century Pope Zosimus (417-418), acting on the lines of Gratian's rescript, summoned the saintly Proculus of Marseilles to appear before him, that holy man very properly treated the summons with contempt. He neither went to Rome nor excused himself for not going. Mgr. Duchesne gives a delightfully frank account of the situation. He says (*Fastes Episcopaux*, i. 105), "Quant à Proculus, il continua de faire la sourde oreille et d'exercer ses droits de métropolitain. C'était un saint homme, en relations d'amitié avec tous les promoteurs de la vie religieuse, avec les disciples de saint Martin, avec saint Jérôme, qui le considérait comme un miroir de perfection, avec saint Honorat, le fondateur de Lérins, qu'il essaya de retenir à Marseille, avec le célèbre Cassien, qu'il parvint à garder auprès de lui. Fort de sa conscience et de ses illustres amitiés, il laissait passer l'orage. Peut-être eût-il bien fait de montrer un peu plus de déférence à l'endroit du siège apostolique. Mais il faut dire à sa décharge qu'il ne lui était pas facile de contrebalancer à Rome et à Ravenne le crédit de son collègue d'Arles [this was the detestable simoniac and intriguer, Patroclus], l'ami, le conseiller du pape Zosime et le favori du vice-empereur Constance. . . . Zosime ne vit donc venir de Marseille ni soumission ni explications." One may add that Proculus persevered in his attitude, and that after Zosimus' death, he was left in peace by Zosimus' successors.

¹ S. Augustin. *Ep.* xliii. cap. v. § 14, *P. L.*, xxxiii. 166.

being one of his subject metropolitans. He justifies Miltiades' action entirely on the ground that he had received authority from the Emperor, who had himself had the matter put into his hands by the action of the Donatists. In an earlier paragraph S. Augustine sketches the line which Secundus of Tigisis ought to have taken, if he had wished to show that he was a real lover of peace. Instead of hurrying on a condemnation of Caecilian and his consecrators, he should have urged his more extreme followers to "betake themselves to our brethren and colleagues, the bishops of the churches beyond the sea, and to present to them, in the first place, a complaint concerning the conduct and contumacy of the accused [*i.e.* of Caecilian and his consecrators], as having, through consciousness of guilt, declined to appear before the tribunal of their colleagues in Africa."¹ It would, of course, be mockery to put such advice into the mouth of Secundus, if every one knew that Caecilian had a right to be tried in Rome rather than in Africa. Caecilian had refused to appear before the synod of Numidian bishops, not because any law or custom required that he should be tried in Rome, but because, as S. Augustine says, "he perceived or suspected" that the Numidian bishops "were biassed by his enemies against the real merits of the case."² I am bold to say that there is no reason for supposing that it was an ancient custom for accused metropolitans in the West to be tried by the pope, or by judges nominated and commissioned by him. What evidence there is points in the opposite direction. The two laws of Valentinian and Gratian created a new jurisdiction, and annexed that jurisdiction to the Roman see. There is no trace of any such arrangement, either in the Nicene or in the Sardican canons.³ So far as the trial of accused metropolitans is concerned, it is not true to say, as Dr. Rivington says, that the imperial legislation "simply supplied legal facilities for executing the judgements of the episcopate, which were arranged in accordance with rules already established by its own action, as, for instance, at Sardica or Nice."⁴

As I have already observed, the legislation of Valentinian and Gratian conferred a second new power on the pope. It

¹ S. August. *Ep.* xliii. cap. iii. § 8, col. 163.

² *Ep.* xliii. cap. iii. § 7.

³ There being no generally recognized metropolitans in the Latin-speaking portion of the Church at the time of the Council of Sardica, except the Bishops of Rome and Carthage, metropolitans are not mentioned in the Latin edition of the Sardican canons; whereas they are mentioned in the Greek edition of the sixth and fourteenth of those canons; but those two canons contain no provisions specially subjecting metropolitans to the see of Rome.

⁴ *Prim. Church*, p. 237.

gave to him the right of receiving and hearing the appeals of condemned bishops, appealing to him from the adverse decision of any of the provincial synods of the West. This was new.¹ It is not until the Council of Sardica that we find any Western canons dealing with appeals from the sentence of a provincial synod. As we have already seen, the Council of Sardica allowed a condemned bishop to appeal to Rome, but did not allow his appeal to be heard at Rome. If the Roman Bishop thought that the case ought to be reheard, he might, according to the rule laid down at Sardica, write to the bishops living nearest the province where the condemnation had taken place, and request them "to investigate the matter thoroughly, and to give sentence in accordance with the truth."² He might also, if he pleased, send priests of his own, representing himself and clothed with his authority, who would assist at the rehearing, and might in some cases be allowed by the local bishops to preside at it.³ Hefele, who tries to make out the best possible case for the Roman claims, admits that the canons of Sardica do not allow the pope to hear at Rome appeals from provincial synods.⁴ But this further step *is* taken by the new laws of Valentinian and Gratian, who therefore in this matter also enlarged the powers of the Roman see.

I think that one may fairly say that the right of judging the metropolitans of the West, and the right of receiving and hearing episcopal appeals from the sentences of those metropolitans, constitute between them a combination of rights which may be fittingly styled a patriarchal jurisdiction. No doubt it was usual for patriarchs to enjoy other prerogatives, as for example that of consecrating the metropolitans of their patriarchate; but it was not until the thirteenth century that this patriarchal privilege was claimed by the popes.⁵ Even the minor right of sending the pall to all the metropolitans of the patriarchate did not become generally established in the West until towards the end of the eighth

¹ Heretics and schismatics, who had been condemned by churches at a distance, often came to Rome, hoping to persuade the rulers of the Roman church to receive them back into communion. But in earlier times they were told that they were asking for something which could not be granted. Compare the case of Marcion, described on p. 198; and see S. Cyprian's strong words repudiating all right of appeal from Africa to Rome, in the case of the schismatic followers of Fortunatus and Felicissimus, quoted on p. 53.

² See the fifth Sardican Canon (Hefele, *E. tr.*, ii. 119, 120).

³ It should be noted that in 419 the papal legates were not allowed to preside at the Council of Carthage. The bishop-legate sat third, and the two priest-legates sat last, below the 217 African bishops who attended the council.

⁴ See Hefele, ii. 116-128.

⁵ See the glosses on the chapters "*Quia igitur*," "*Qui in aliquo*," and "*Pudenda*" (Gratian. *Decret.*, pars i. dist. lxiii. c. ix.; dist. li. c. 5; pars ii. causa xxiv. qu. i. c. 33).

century.¹ As regards the summoning of patriarchal synods, I know of no instance of such a proceeding on the part of the pope during the times anterior to the rescript of Gratian.² In those earlier times the Roman see had always been the head of the West. It was the only Western apostolic see. It was being continually consulted, as being for the West the great repository of apostolical traditions. Moreover, the pope was, as a rule, the representative and spokesman of the West in all dealings with the East. But all this honour and influence did not amount to what in later times would be called patriarchal jurisdiction. The germ of such a jurisdiction was created by the Council of Sardica; and a substantial instalment of the fulness of such jurisdiction was conferred on the Roman see by the Emperors Valentinian and Gratian.³ The Eastern patriarchates were created by the synodical legislation of the Church.⁴ The Roman patriarchate was really created by the Emperors. No doubt the provisions of the final rescript of Gratian had been sanctioned by the council of Italian bishops, which met at Rome in May or June, 382. But an Italian council had no power to speak in the name of the churches of Gaul, or of Africa, or of Britain, or of Ireland, and therefore it is no wonder that the new patriarchal jurisdiction, claimed by Rome, met with a determined resistance both in Africa and in Gaul, and that it was ignored in Britain and Ireland. As we shall see, it needed further imperial legislation before this new jurisdiction was really accepted in Gaul. It was repudiated by the African Church in the time of S. Augustine; and centuries would have to elapse before the Celtic Churches of Great Britain and of Ireland⁵ bowed their necks to the Roman yoke.

Ecclesiastically, the new legislation, so far as it applied to countries outside of Italy, was null and void. Still, it was

¹ See Dom Ruinart's *Disquisitio Historica de Pallio Archiepiscopali*, cap. xi., in the *Ouvrages Posthumes de D. Jean Mabillon et de D. Thierry Ruinart*, edit. 1724, tom. ii. pp. 457-460.

² The Roman council, over which Pope Damasus presided in 371, was attended by 93 bishops from Italy and Gaul; but it was a council held "ex rescripto imperiali" (cf. Coleti, ii. 1043), and therefore it affords no proof that Damasus was accustomed to convoke the bishops of the whole West to assemble in patriarchal synod.

³ On the question whether Gratian enlarged the jurisdiction given to the Roman bishop by Valentinian, see the Additional Note 66, p. 487.

⁴ Compare the second canon of the second Ecumenical Council (Hefele, ii. 354, 355), and also the sixth canon attributed to the same council (Hefele, ii. 363-365), but really emanating from the Council of Constantinople of the year 382. Compare also the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon (Hefele, iii. 410, 411), and the action by which the Council of Chalcedon created the patriarchate of Jerusalem (Hefele, iii. 382).

⁵ Ireland was outside the limits of the Roman empire, and therefore in that country the new Roman patriarchate had not a basis even in civil legislation. It was not until the twelfth century that the Irish Church became Romanized.

law, and the powers given to the pope were capable of being enforced by the whole might of the Roman empire. Was I not right in saying that the pontificate of Damasus forms a new point of departure in regard to all matters connected with the growth of the papal jurisdiction? I sometimes think that the Roman pontiffs, having acquired this vast extension of jurisdiction by the act of the civil power without any proper concurrence of the Church, were driven to devise some presentable theory which should constitute a religious basis for the new authority which they had acquired. Their vague claim to be successors of S. Peter would be an obvious basis to put forward. That claim, in the sense in which they made it, being really unhistorical and baseless, there could be no definition of the privileges conferred by it, either in Scripture or tradition. This absence of authoritative definition would leave them free to plead their succession from S. Peter as a religious basis for a jurisdiction derived from the Emperor. Whether Damasus did so plead it I cannot say, but I find in the decretals of Siricius, the successor of Damasus, a new way of speaking about the privileges supposed to be inherited by the Roman see from S. Peter. I must, however, finish what I have to say about Damasus before passing on to Siricius.

In January, 379, the Emperor Gratian joined Theodosius to himself as a partner in the government of the empire, and he assigned the East to Theodosius, while he reserved the West as his own immediate share. The empire had been divided in this way on previous occasions, but Gratian's partition did not proceed exactly on the old lines. Hitherto, as a rule, Eastern as well as Western Illyricum had belonged to the West. *Now* Gratian gave up Eastern Illyricum and united it to that part of the empire, which he was committing to Theodosius.¹ Damasus saw very clearly that there was great danger that Eastern Illyricum would pass away from his sphere of influence, or rather (to use what after the legislation of the Council of Sardica and of the Emperor Valentinian would be the more accurate expression) from his jurisdiction, unless something was done to safeguard his rights. We may be certain that, though eighteen years later the Catholic Council of Sardica seems not to have been known to S. Augustine,² and though thirty-nine years later the Sardican canons were unknown to the bishops of the African Church generally, yet both the council and its canons were

¹ Tillemont (*Histoire des Empereurs*, ed. 1701, tom. v. pp. 716-718) shows that Gratian gave Eastern Illyricum to Theodosius, *when he made him Emperor*, *i.e.* in 379. Compare Duchesne (*Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 41).

² Cf. S. August. *Ep.* xliv. cap. iii. § 6, *P. L.*, xxxiii. 176.

well known in 379 in Eastern Illyricum. Sardica is itself situated in Eastern Illyricum, and three of the Sardican canons¹ dealt with local matters connected with the Church of Thessalonica, the most powerful see in Eastern Illyricum. Moreover out of 77 bishops present at Sardica, whose sees are known, 42 came from Eastern Illyricum.² If the canons of Sardica were in force there, then undoubtedly Damasus had a certain jurisdiction of a limited kind in the Eastern Illyrian provinces.³ But besides the jurisdiction conferred by the canons of Sardica, there was the newer and much fuller jurisdiction conferred by Valentinian. Damasus would be very loth to lose those fair provinces out of his patriarchate.⁴ At the same time, it would not be very easy for him to interfere otherwise than exceptionally in the affairs of provinces which belonged to the Eastern Emperor. He therefore gave a commission to Acholius, Bishop of Thessalonica, creating him his vicar in Eastern Illyricum, and authorizing him to exercise the powers which belonged to himself as Patriarch of the West.⁵ This was the first instance of the popes attempting anything of this kind. Until the Council of Sardica there would have been no ground for such action, because up to that time the popes had no jurisdiction of any sort or kind outside of Italy. But the legislation of Valentinian I., confirmed later on by that of Gratian, had made Damasus a very great potentate, a sort of spiritual prefect of the praetorium throughout the West; and as the prefects had their vicars, so the popes would think that it was natural for them to have vicars also. Accordingly Acholius of Thessalonica was empowered by Damasus to exercise whatever jurisdiction he, the pope, possessed in the provinces of Eastern Illyricum.⁶

¹ Namely, the sixteenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth, according to Hefele's numbering.

² Compare Gwatkin's *Studies in Arianism*, p. 121, note 1.

³ It is worth mentioning that one of the Sardican canons on appeals to Rome, namely, the fourth, was proposed by a bishop of Eastern Illyricum, Gaudentius of Naissus in Dacia.

⁴ Cf. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 41.

⁵ If Damasus had thought that there was any possibility of making good a claim to universal jurisdiction over the whole East, there would have been as much necessity for him to create vicars in Egypt and Syria and Asia Minor as in Eastern Illyricum.

⁶ The proof of this statement may be seen in the letters of Pope Innocent I. to Anysius and Rufus, two successive bishops of Thessalonica, in which he confirms to Anysius and imparts to Rufus vicarial powers over Eastern Illyricum, and refers to the similar action taken by his predecessors, Damasus, Siricius, and Anastasius, in favour of Acholius, the predecessor of Anysius, and of Anysius himself (cf. Coleti, *Concilia*, v. 845, 846). The letters of Damasus to Acholius and Anysius, to which Innocent here refers, are lost; for the two letters of Damasus to Acholius, which were read at the Roman Council under Boniface II., in A.D. 531, have

While the see of Rome was thus enlarging the bounds of its jurisdiction in the West by the help of the imperial power, its relations with the East remained unchanged, so far as jurisdiction was concerned. No doubt the East was conscious that a great ecclesiastical power was rising in the West, but it was a power to which it owed no allegiance, but only the debt of Christian brotherhood and charity, and the respect due to the see which had the primacy of honour. The attitude of the East towards Rome comes out very clearly in connexion with the schism of Paulinus at Antioch. The origin of that schism goes as far back as the year 330, or the beginning of 331, when S. Eustathius, the orthodox Bishop of Antioch, was deposed on false charges of Sabellianism and immorality, by Eusebius of Nicomedia, Eusebius of Caesarea, and other bishops, who sympathized in varying degrees with Arianism. The Emperor Constantine banished S. Eustathius from Antioch; but before departing, Eustathius enjoined on his people the duty of patiently continuing in the Church of Antioch, even though Arianizing bishops might be set over them. They were to remain and strengthen the faith of the poor and uninstructed, and to do what they could to resist the wolves who would otherwise ravage the flock.¹ S. Chrysostom, who tells us this, adds that events showed the wisdom of the saint's counsel, for the great mass of the Catholics refused to set up any separate conventicles, but attended the principal churches of the city, even when the bishops thrust in by the Arianizing Emperors were heretical; and so the flock remained Catholic, though it had a succession of heretical chief pastors.² At last, by the good providence of God, a saintly and orthodox bishop, Meletius, who had formerly occupied the see of Sebaste in the Lesser Armenia, was appointed Bishop of Antioch. Catholics and

nothing to do with this particular subject. The original letter from Siricius to Anysius is also lost, but a second letter referring to some of the contents of the first is extant (cf. Coleti, *ubi supra*). Duchesne, in an article entitled *L'Illyricum ecclésiastique* (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, erster Band, p. 543, 1892; see also his *Églises Séparées*, p. 259, edit. 1896), seems to pass over the action of Damasus in this matter, and to suppose that the vicariate of Thessalonica was created by Siricius. I do not understand how the clear statement of Pope Innocent can be got rid of; but, whichever view is finally adopted, my argument remains unaffected.

¹ Cf. S. Chrys. *Hom. in S. Eustathium*, § 4, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 609.

² Tillemont (x. 524) says that these Arianizing bishops of Antioch "were not visibly separated from the communion of the universal Church, and most of them concealed their heresy somewhat." However, Stephen and Eudoxius were openly heretical. The former was anathematized by name at the Council of Sardica, as being "one of the heads of the Arian heresy." And S. Hilary, in his *Lib. contr. Constantium Imp.* (cap. xiii., *P. L.*, x. 591, 592), describes the horrible blasphemies which he heard Eudoxius utter in the church at Antioch, while he was bishop there. Baronius (*Annal.*, ad ann. 362, § xlii., edit. 1654, iv. 24) calls Eudoxius "haeticorum omnium scelestissimus."

Arians united in electing him, the Arians supposing him to be Arian, and the Catholics having reason to believe that he was Catholic. In a sermon, preached soon after his election, he plainly declared his sentiments, and openly professed the Catholic faith in its fulness in the presence of the Arian Emperor Constantius. Now, it happened that there was a small body of ardent Catholics in Antioch who had, ever since the banishment of S. Eustathius, held aloof from the main body of the Antiochene Church, and had worshipped separately, having as their leader a worthy priest named Paulinus. There was, no doubt, much to be said in justification of the course which they took, although it was in opposition to the counsel of S. Eustathius, whom they specially professed to follow, and after whose name they were commonly called Eustathians. But now that at length the bishop, accepted by the great majority of the Church people in the city, was thoroughly Catholic, there was a splendid opportunity for healing the schism. However, Paulinus and his party still held aloof. A few months after Meletius had been enthroned in the episcopal chair, the very celebrated and very influential Council of Alexandria was held under the presidency of S. Athanasius. This council carefully considered the position of affairs at Antioch, and it recommended that the whole body of Catholics in that city should unite together.¹ It accordingly appointed a commission, headed by S. Eusebius of Vercellae, which was to proceed to Antioch and bring about the much-desired reunion. Unfortunately a hot-headed bishop from Sardinia, named Lucifer, who immediately afterwards broke away from the Church with his followers, reached Antioch before the commission sent by S. Athanasius and by the other Fathers of the Council of Alexandria. Instead of reuniting the two parties of Catholics, and inducing them all to acknowledge S. Meletius as bishop, which was obviously the right thing to do,² Lucifer consecrated to the episcopate Paulinus, the priest of the Eustathians. Thus the schism was made tenfold more difficult to heal. Bishop was now pitted against bishop. But the blame of the accentuated schism, which ensued, must be laid on Lucifer who consecrated, and on Paulinus who allowed himself to be consecrated. This grievous scandal took place in the year 362. The great

¹ Dom Montfaucon, the Benedictine editor of S. Chrysostom, in the *Monitum* to S. Chrysostom's homily *De Anathematice* (*Opp.* S. Chrys., ed. Ben., Venet., 1734, tom. i. p. 690), describes the action of S. Athanasius thus: "Athanasius in Synodo Alexandrinâ anno 362, totis viribus nitebatur, ut Eustathiani Meletianis adungerentur, omnesque Catholici unum Meletium Episcopum agnoscerent."

² See Cardinal Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*, 3rd edit., 1871, pp. 374, 375.

majority of the orthodox Christians of Antioch were in the communion of S. Meletius, while a small minority followed Paulinus. Apparently for some years the Roman Church was undecided as to which side should receive her support ; but in the year 375 Pope Damasus plainly declared himself in favour of Paulinus, and wrote letters to him, treating him as the one Catholic Bishop of Antioch, and ignoring altogether the claims of S. Meletius. About a year later, in the latter half of 376 or early in 377, Pope Damasus went further, and allowed Peter of Alexandria to speak openly in his presence on a public occasion of S. Meletius and of the glorious S. Eusebius of Samosata as if they were Arian heretics. One cannot help seeing a certain analogy between the state of things in Antioch at that time and the state of things in England now. The Church of Antioch under S. Meletius numbered in its fold the great majority of those who held the Catholic faith, as the Church of England does at the present day. The minority of separatists under Paulinus had the support of Damasus and the Roman Church, and thus occupied a position in some way parallel to the Romanist communion in this country, though there can be no question that Paulinus would have rejected with horror the Vatican decrees, if they had been proposed to him for his acceptance. All the great saints of the Eastern Church, and above all S. Basil, supported S. Meletius. They were on the spot, they knew the facts, and they treated S. Meletius with the greatest veneration as a saint, and as the occupant of the apostolic throne of Antioch.¹ They communicated with him, although Rome ignored him ; they rejected the communion of Paulinus, although Rome supported him.

Towards the end of the year 374, or thereabouts, before Damasus had entered into direct relations with Paulinus, a fresh complication added to the confusion. Vitalis, who had for many years worked as a priest under S. Meletius, became infected with the heresy of Apollinarius of Laodicea. He seceded from the communion of S. Meletius, and, drawing after him a considerable number of Catholics, he presided over them as their priest and pastor. Later on, in 376, Apollinarius consecrated Vitalis to be the Apollinarian Bishop of Antioch. Thus, from 374 onwards, besides the Arians under their bishop, Euzoïus, there were three contending parties at Antioch, namely, the Catholics under S. Meletius ;

¹ In the year 379 a great council of Eastern bishops was held at Antioch. One hundred and fifty-three prelates attended, amongst whom were S. Eusebius of Samosata, S. Pelagius of Laodicea, S. Eulogius of Edessa, and S. Gregory of Nyssa. As Tillemont (viii. 367) says, it was one of the most illustrious councils ever held in the Church. S. Meletius presided. The whole East accepted him as the rightful bishop, though he was rejected by the Church of Rome.

the Eustathians, who also were orthodox, under Paulinus; and the Apollinarians under Vitalis.

About a year before the secession of Vitalis, there had arrived in Antioch a young layman, twenty-seven years old, who was destined to play an important part in the history of the Church. His name was Jerome. He was a Latin, born in Dalmatia, but catechized and baptized at about the age of twenty in Rome. He was a member of the local Roman Church, and had formed his conceptions of the position of the Roman Church in Rome itself, where, as I have said, he received his instruction in Christianity. He came to Syria to practise the ascetic life, and he established himself among the monks of the desert of Chalcis. After he had stayed among these monks for some little time, he began to find his position uncomfortable, on account of the disputes at Antioch. As a member of the Roman Church, he would be naturally drawn to sympathize with Paulinus, who was accustomed to speak of the *One Hypostasis* in the Trinity, which was the formula then used at Rome. But the monks would for the most part be in communion with S. Meletius, who was the bishop generally recognized at Antioch and in the East. They no doubt used the formula of the *Three Hypostases*, which prevailed in the East, and which later on was accepted also in the West. S. Jerome therefore wrote a curious letter to the pope, asking for directions as to what he was to do. Any one who is acquainted with S. Jerome's writings knows that he is a writer who never minces his words. He is apt to exaggerate. He throws himself violently into one side of a disputed question, and perhaps a few years afterwards he throws himself with equal violence into the opposite side of the same question. God forbid that I should even seem to depreciate the many noble qualities and noble gifts which he possessed; but no one is faultless, and S. Jerome would have been the last person to claim faultlessness for himself.¹ Certainly, if ever there was a case when a man might be excused for exaggerating the authority of the Roman see, such an excuse might be pleaded on behalf of S. Jerome. A Latin, living in the East, and suffering continual personal annoyance arising out of the religious divisions of the East, he might well turn to Rome, the church of his baptism, which was living in comparative quiet, and was basking in the sunshine of the world's

¹ Ultramontane writers make no scruple about pointing out S. Jerome's faults, when it suits them to do so. The Jesuit, Father Bottalla, in his treatise on the *Infalibility of the Pope* (edit. 1870, p. 185), speaking of S. Jerome, says, "This holy Doctor's tendency to give too ready credence to unauthorized rumours is well known. Thus, as is pointed out by Zaccaria, he represents S. Chrysostom as an Origenist, and he adopts the falsehoods spread abroad by the adherents of Paulinus to the prejudice of S. Meletius of Antioch."

favour, and was supporting faithfully the traditional teaching of the Church, and might seek for direction from the great pontiff who ruled in the capital of the empire and, in S. Jerome's view, had succeeded to S. Peter's own bishopric. Practically, at the time when S. Jerome wrote, the whole West was Catholic, and Rome was the centre of the West; while the East was suffering persecution from an Arian Emperor, and was split and divided and weakened. Twenty years before, when Pope Liberius had given way, and had surrendered the Nicene formula,¹ and when, shortly afterwards, the Western bishops were deluded into signing an Arian creed at the Council of Ariminum, no one would have looked to the pope or to the West for trustworthy guidance. Then S. Athanasius stood alone against the world. But things were altered now, and S. Jerome wrote in his perplexity to Pope Damasus as follows: "Since the East tears into pieces the Lord's coat, . . . therefore by me is the chair of S. Peter to be consulted, and that faith which is praised by the apostle's mouth; thence now seeking food for my soul, whence of old I received the robe of Christ. . . . I speak with the successor of the fisherman, and the disciple of the Cross. I, who follow none as my chief but Christ, am associated in communion with thy blessedness, that is, with the see of Peter. On that rock the Church is built, I know. Whoso shall eat the Lamb outside that house is profane. If any one shall not be in the ark of Noah, he will perish when the flood prevails. . . . I know not Vitalis [the Apollinarian]; I reject Meletius; I am ignorant of Paulinus. Whoso gathereth not with thee scattereth; that is, he who is not of Christ is of Antichrist."² As far as I know, in all the writings of the Fathers during the first four centuries, this passage stands alone. Of course, no Catholic would dream of departing from the general teaching of the Fathers in order to adhere to the exaggerated statements of one young man who was in sore perplexity.³ We can make excuses for him, we can try and

¹ Hefele admits that Liberius "renounced the formula *ὁμοούσιος*," and that he "renounced the letter of the Nicene faith" (*History of the Church Councils*, vol. ii. pp. 235, 246, Eng. trans.). See also Appendix G, on Sozomen's account of Liberius' fall (pp. 275-287).

² *Ep.* xv. *ad Damasum*, § 2, *P. L.*, xxiii. 356. This letter was probably written about Easter in the year 375 (see pp. 311-313).

³ That he was a young man appears clearly from his own statements. Three or four months before he wrote the above-quoted letter to Damasus, he had written a letter (*Ep.* xiv.) to his friend Heliodorus. Nineteen years afterwards he describes this letter to Heliodorus as having been written "dum essem adolescens, immo pene puer" (cf. *Ep.* lii. *ad Nepotian.*, § 1, *P. L.*, xxii. 527). I have followed the Bollandists in assigning to the year 375 the letter to Heliodorus (cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. viii. Septembr., pp. 444, 447). Vallarsi assigns it to the close of the preceding year (cf. *P. L.*, tom. xxiii. coll. li. et 29). It is, moreover, to be noted that in his preface to the Book of Daniel S. Jerome speaks of his early studies in

see how he ever came to use such words, but we unhesitatingly set them aside as exaggerated and unworthy. If they are taken literally and accepted, we must say that all the glorious Eastern saints of that age were living in deadly sin. They were supporting those who were "profane;" they were communicating with those who were "not in the ark," and who were off "the rock." Take S. Basil as an example. He was the great leader of the Catholic army of the East; fighting a tremendous battle with heresy; undoubtedly the most heroic man of his time. Not a comparative novice like S. Jerome, who had only been baptized nine years before; but a man in the maturity of his power, forty-six years old, the metropolitan of the great see of Caesarea in Cappadocia. He also had before him the same question to decide. Should he communicate with Meletius, whom Rome rejected, or with Paulinus, whom Rome supported? He decided the question by communicating with Meletius and by rejecting Paulinus. It is doubtful whether the ideas expressed in S. Jerome's fine phrases had ever presented themselves to his mind. If they had, he had seen through their hollowness. Moreover, he had had some experience of what Pope Damasus was like, and whether he really was a rock from which the Church in the East might derive solid support. Over and over again he had written to Damasus to ask him, living, as he was, in comparative peace and quiet, to help the Eastern churches which were suffering persecution; but very little was done, although much might have been done. It was proposed in the year 376 that fresh letters should be written to the West, to be sent by a zealous priest named Dorotheus. S. Basil, writing to S. Eusebius of Samosata, says, "For myself, then, I do not see what one should send by him, or how agree with those who send. . . . It occurs to me to use Diomed's language [to Agamemnon in the *Iliad* about Achilles]: 'Would that thou hadst never sued for aid,'¹ since, saith he, the man 'is arrogant.' For indeed disdainful tempers, treated with attention, are wont to become

Hebrew, which commenced in 375, and he describes himself as being at that time an "adolescensulus" (cf. *P. L.*, xxviii. 1291). He was, in fact, about 29 years old, and was still a layman. His serious theological studies can hardly be said to have begun. Even his literary career was only just beginning. He had written a few letters to friends, and also his "highly idealized" *Life of S. Paul the Hermit*, and perhaps that earlier commentary on Obadiah, of which he was afterwards so ashamed, as having been the offspring of his "puerilis ingenii" (cf. *Comment. in Abdiam Prolog.*, *P. L.*, xxv. 1098), but which was certainly not written earlier than 375 (cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. viii. Septembr., pp. 450, 451). Romanist controversialists can hardly be serious when they quote in grave theological argument the unbalanced expressions of a youthful layman smarting under extreme provocation.

¹ *Iliad*, ix. 694, 695. We may suppose that the whole passage was running

more contemptuous than usual." S. Basil is, of course, speaking of Damasus. He goes on, "And if the Lord should be gracious unto us, what other support do we need? But if the wrath of God remain upon us, what help can we get from Western superciliousness? They who neither know nor endure to learn the truth, but, preoccupied with false suspicions, are doing now just what they did before in the case of Marcellus, when they quarrelled with those who reported to them the truth, and by their own action supported heresy. For I myself, without concert with any, was minded to write to their leader [Damasus]: nothing indeed about ecclesiastical matters, except so much as to hint that they neither know the truth of what is going on among us, nor accept the way by which they might learn it; but generally about the duty of not attacking those who are humbled by trials, and of not taking disdainfulness for dignity, a sin which of itself is sufficient to set a man at enmity with God."¹ It is worth while to quote, by the way, Bossuet's comment on this passage. He says, "It is clear that the confirming of heresy was roundly and flatly, without any excuse, without any attempt to modify, imputed by Basil to two decrees of Roman pontiffs *de fide*."² What I gather from the whole passage is that S. Basil had no conception of the Bishop of Rome being the divinely appointed monarch of the Church.³ He thought of him as a very powerful bishop, as, of course, he was, but still as one who was essentially his equal, to whom he owed no allegiance, with whose help he could dispense, and whose

in S. Basil's mind; I therefore subjoin the late Lord Derby's translation (Homer's *Iliad*, ix. 805-811)—

"Would that thou ne'er hadst stooped with costly gifts
To sue for aid from Peleus' matchless son;
For he before was over-proud, and now
Thine offers will have tenfold swollen his pride.
But leave we him according to his will,
To go or stay: he then will join the fight,
When his own spirit shall prompt, or Heaven inspire."

¹ *Ep.* ccxxxix., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1730, iii. 368.

² *Gallia Orthodoxa*, cap. lxx., *Œuvres*, edit. Versailles, 1817, tom. xxxi. p. 138.

³ One may illustrate S. Basil's conception of the Roman Bishop's position by the salutation prefixed to the letter which S. Meletius, S. Basil, and thirty other Eastern bishops sent to Pope Damasus and other Western bishops by the hands of the Milanese deacon, S. Sabinus, in the year 372. The salutation runs as follows: "To the most God-beloved and holy brethren and fellow-ministers, the like-minded bishops of Italy and Gaul, Meletius, Eusebius, Basil, etc., send greeting in the Lord" (S. Basil. *Ep.* xcii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 183). Tillemont (ix. 668, 669) shows that the term "Italy" in this salutation includes Rome and the suburbicarian churches. S. Basil, in his 243rd *Epistle* (*Opp.*, iii. 372) addresses Damasus and the Western bishops in similar terms. Mansi (iii. 468), speaking of the sending of the first of these letters, says that the Eastern bishops "synodicam Sabino tradunt *Damaso* deferendam." Imagine the Anglo-Roman bishops of the present day writing in this fashion to Pope Leo XIII. and to the bishops of Italy and France.

action or inaction he was entitled freely to criticize. If S. Jerome in his younger days thought otherwise, his opinion must be quoted for what it is worth, either as his own personal view, or at most as the theory which he had imbibed at Rome. It was not the general view of the saints or of the Church. It does not represent the tradition received from the apostles.

And practically what did S. Jerome gain by following the lead of Damasus? Why, this! that he joined himself to the separatist body of which Paulinus was bishop, and rejected the communion of S. Meletius, the true occupant of the apostolic see of Antioch. Six years after his letter to Damasus, he must have had his Romanizing views somewhat rudely shaken. By that time the Eastern Church had got out of its difficulties. The persecuting Emperor Valens was dead. The orthodox Theodosius was on the throne. The second Ecumenical Council was assembled at Constantinople, and S. Jerome himself was residing in that city. The Ultramontane historian, Cardinal Orsi, tells us that "perhaps there has not been a council in which has been found a greater number of confessors and saints."¹ *There were gathered S. Gregory of Nazianzus, S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Peter of Sebaste, S. Amphilocheus of Iconium, S. Pelagius of Laodicea, S. Eulogius of Edessa, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, and many more. And who was the prelate who was recognized by all as worthy of presiding over this wonderful assemblage? Cardinal Orsi shall tell us. "But above all," he says, "S. Meletius was pre-eminent, both for the dignity of his see, and for the excellency of his virtue."² We must remember that S. Meletius was still out of communion with Rome. Damasus still supported the separatist body under Paulinus, and still refused letters of communion to Meletius. However, that blessed saint, though rejected by Rome, was accepted with veneration by the Church; and by the agreement of all he took his seat in the presidential chair of the second Ecumenical Council.³ According to S. Jerome's youthful view, he was off "the rock," he was "outside the ark," he*

¹ Orsi, *Ist. Ecc.*, xviii. 63 (tom. viii. p. 135, ed. Rom. 1751): "Dimodochè non v'è forse concilio, nel quale si sia trovato un maggior numero di confessori e di santi."

² "Sopra tutti però risplendeva sì per la dignità della sede, sì per l'eccellenza della virtù s. Melezio."

³ Orsi (xviii. 64, tom. viii. p. 137) says, "Il capo, il condottiere, il padre, e la guida di questa sacra adunanza finchè egli visse, fu s. Melezio, e dopo la sua morte s. Gregorio, e finalmente dopo la sua dimissione Nettario." Orsi here enumerates the three prelates, who in succession presided over the council, viz. S. Meletius, S. Gregory of Nazianzus, and finally Nectarius. Hefele (*Councils*, Eng. trans., ii. 344) says, "Meletius of Antioch at first presided, and after his death Gregory of Nazianzus."

was among "the profane." One may fairly suppose that this object-lesson on a large scale must have driven those fancies out of S. Jerome's mind. I do not think that he ever again recurs to them.¹ While the council was still sitting, S. Meletius died, still out of communion with Rome.² One may say that he was canonized there and then. The saints vied with each other in preaching his panegyric. We still possess S. Gregory Nyssen's discourse on the occasion. The people flocked to get strips of linen which had touched his body. That body was embalmed and transported with all honour to Antioch; and five years afterwards, S. Chrysostom, preaching on his festival, tells us of the devotion which the faithful of Antioch felt towards their glorious saint.³ Even Rome had ultimately to alter her views; and though the pope repudiated him and allowed him to be insulted as an Arian during his life, the Roman Church invokes him as a saint now that he is dead. His name is entered in the Roman Martyrology on the 12th of February. I think that I was justified in saying that, however much Pope Damasus might have succeeded, with the help of the imperial power, in enlarging his jurisdiction in the West, the East continued firm in her traditional belief and practice, and acknowledged no jurisdiction, but only a primacy of honour, in the occupant of the papal chair.

APPENDIX D.

Did the Council of Chalcedon blame Dioscorus for presiding over the Latrocinium without papal authorization? Did Hosius preside at Nicaea as a papal legate? (see p. 138).

THERE is a passage in Dr. Rivington's book, in which he is arguing in favour of the notion that Hosius was acting as legate of Pope Silvester when he presided at the Council of Nicaea. In the course of his argument Dr. Rivington says, "Could the Council of Chalcedon have blamed Dioscorus for sitting as president in the presence of papal legates

¹ See Additional Note 67, p. 488.

² Tillemont (xxi. 662) says, "Si tous ceux qui meurent hors de la communion de Rome, ne peuvent meriter le titre de Saints et de Confesseurs, c'estoit à lui [Baronius] à faire effacer du Martyrologe S. Melece et S. Flavien d'Antioche, S. Elie de Jerusalem, et S. Daniel Stylite." I have discussed more fully the question whether S. Meletius died out of communion with Rome on pp. 346-350.

³ *Hom. in S. Melet.*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1734, ii. 518-523.

by the express order of the Emperor at the Robber-council of Ephesus, and no one have pressed the point that at Nice even a lesser Western bishop had sat above even Rome, not to speak of Alexandria and Antioch?"¹

The answer to this argument is very simple. Dioscorus was never blamed by the Council of Chalcedon for presiding in the presence of the papal legates at the Robber-synod. And the fact of this absence of blame is all the more significant, because one of S. Leo's legates at Chalcedon, the Bishop Lucentius, did, in the very first session of the council, bring forward as a special accusation against Dioscorus that he had "held a council [the *Latrocinium*] without the permission of the Apostolic See," a thing, he said, "which never was done, and never was lawful."² That point, therefore, was brought clearly before the notice of the council. It is consequently very important to observe that there is not the faintest allusion to this charge in any of the 193 sentences condemning Dioscorus, which have been preserved in the Latin acts of the council.³ The legates themselves, when they came to formulate their sentence of condemnation, did not venture to make any reference to this point.⁴ Nor is it mentioned in the various letters of the council, announcing the deposition of Dioscorus, and addressed respectively to the culprit himself, to the clergy of Alexandria, to the two Emperors, and to the Empress Pulcheria.⁵ The charge had been made in what seems to have been a passing remark of one of the legates, but it led to no result, and it was either tacitly withdrawn, or set aside by the council as inappropriate.

The fact is that S. Leo himself did not publicly claim any inherent right to preside at an Ecumenical Council; and he acted wisely, for he had no such right; and if he had made any claim of that kind, he would have run a great risk of seeing it disallowed.

It is interesting to compare the expressions used by S. Leo about the position to be occupied by the legates whom he was sending to the Robber-synod, with the parallel expressions which he used two years afterwards about the legates whom he was sending to Chalcedon. In the case of the Robber-synod, the Emperor, "following," to use his own words, "the rule of the holy Fathers,"⁶ had appointed Dioscorus, who was at that time the universally acknowledged Pope of Alexandria, to preside. S. Leo, therefore, carefully avoided saying a word about his legates presiding. In various letters, addressed respectively to the Emperor, to Pulcheria, to Bishop Julian of Cos, and to the Robber-synod itself, he defines the function of his legates to be that of representing his own presence. These are his words: "qui ad vicem praesentiae meae pro negotii qualitate sufficerent;"⁷ "qui vicem praesentiae meae implere sufficerent;"⁸ "qui praesentiae meae implent vicem;"⁹ "quos ex latere

¹ *Prim. Church*, p. 163.

² *Ibid.*, iv. 1303-1335.

³ *Ibid.*, iv. 1348-1356.

⁴ S. Leon. *Ep.* xxix. *ad Theodosium Augustum*, P. L., liv. 783.

⁵ *Ep.* xxx. *ad Pulcheriam Augustam*, P. L., liv. 789.

⁶ *Ep.* xxxvii. *ad Theodosium Augustum*, P. L., liv. 812. Similarly, in the *commonitorium* of Pope Zosimus, which was read at the Council of Carthage in

² Coleti, iv. 865.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iv. 1303-1306.

⁶ *Ibid.*, iv. 884.

meo vice mea misi;”¹ “qui vice mea sancto conventui vestrae fraternitatis intersint.”² It will be noticed that there is not a word here about presidency.

After the conclusion of the Robber-council, amid all S. Leo's complaints about what had taken place there, he never once formulated any protest against Dioscorus having presided.³ That point had been settled by Theodosius, the convener of the council.

But when two years later, in June, 451, S. Leo had received Marcian's edict convoking the council which was ultimately held at Chalcedon, he pointed out to the Emperor that strong reasons existed, which made it desirable that at this new council his chief legate should preside. In his letter (*Ep.* lxxxix., *P. L.*, liv. 930) he first names his legates and specially the chief legate, Paschasinus, “qui vicem praesentiae meae possit implere.” Then he forecasts what the issue of the council is likely to be. And finally in cautious words he approaches the question of the presidency. He says, “But because certain of the brethren (I mention the matter with sorrow) have failed in maintaining catholic firmness in opposition to the whirlwinds of error, it is convenient (convenit) that my aforesaid brother and fellow-bishop [Paschasinus] should preside in my place over the synod.” It was, in fact, the case that at that particular moment the occupants of all the great sees had either been mixed up with the Robber-council, or had been in close relations with those who had been leaders in that disastrous assembly, and it was eminently desirable that S. Leo's legates should

May, 419 (*Mansi*, iv. 403), that pope, addressing his legates, Faustinus, Philip, and Asellus, says, “Vos ita ut nostra, imo quia nostra ibi in vobis praesentia est, cuncta peragite.” The legates did not preside, although Zosimus' presence was regarded as being in them (see p. 185).

¹ *Ep.* xxxiv. ad *Julianum Episcopum Coensem*, *P. L.*, liv. 802.

² *Ep.* xxxiii. ad *Ephesinam Synodum Secundam*, *P. L.*, liv. 799.

³ It may, perhaps, be asked whether any protest was made against Dioscorus presiding, by the pope's legates, at the *Latrocinium*. It must be stated in reply that the legates were undoubtedly present at and took part in the long proceedings of the first session, notwithstanding the fact that they did not preside. They probably did make a protest of some kind against the presidency of Dioscorus, and claimed for themselves that function, as representing the first see. The only question that can be raised is—whether they took their seats in the second place, next after the president, Dioscorus, or whether, by way of accentuating their protest against his presidency, they refused to take their seats, and stood during the whole session. Hefele (*Councils*, iii. 259) appears to favour the latter view. The idea that the legates stood rests mainly on an obscure passage of Liberatus (*Breviar.*, cap. xii., *P. L.*, lxxviii. 1004), an archdeacon of Carthage, who wrote an historical account of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, more than a hundred years after the date of the *Latrocinium*. The obscurity of the passage in Liberatus is admitted by the Jesuit Garnier, who edited his works (cf. *P. L.*, lxxviii. 1008). Liberatus does not seem to have seen the Acts of the *Latrocinium*, but he undoubtedly had access to good documents; yet he occasionally makes mistakes. He speaks of Ibas being summoned three times to appear before the council, whereas Ibas was in prison at Antioch, and the Acts make no mention of his being summoned. It seems to me that Liberatus possibly based his statement about the legates on a misunderstanding of an exclamation, which was made by the bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, who were present at the Council of Chalcedon, and which is recorded in the acts of that council (*Coleti*, iv. 896). The matter is of no real consequence, but my own impression is that the legates sat; and this seems to be Garnier's own view (*u.s.*), as it certainly is Tillemont's (xv. 904, 905).

preside at the council which was going to reverse the decisions of Dioscorus and his accomplices. There was no great commanding character like Hosius, occupying a lesser see, who could be appropriately raised to the presidency. The interests of Christendom demanded that the Emperor should come to a determination in favour of Paschasius and his colleagues. But it is important to notice that Leo makes no claim of possessing any inherent right to preside. He does not venture to say that, as the divinely appointed monarch of the Church, he and none but he or his representatives could be thought of for the presidential chair. He argues the matter in a perfectly reasonable way, and his reasoning had its effect. His legates did preside.

Accordingly, in his letter to the council he names his legates, and adds, "Let your fraternities consider that in these brethren I am presiding over the synod, my presence not being separated from you, since I am with you in my representatives."¹ Previously, when writing to the Robber-council, he had said concerning his legates, "In my place they are present in the holy assembly of your fraternities;"² but he had made no allusion to his presiding in his representatives over the council. The contrast between his language in the one case and in the other is clear. Whatever he may have thought in his heart of hearts about his own right to preside, he knew well that the Church at large was willing to accept a president from the orthodox Emperor, and that the urging of his own claim on the ground of inherent right would be a perfectly futile proceeding which could only end in disaster.

If this was the state of opinion in the Church in the time of S. Leo, we can well believe that in the time of the Council of Nicaea, 125 years earlier, Constantine, who convoked the council, would as a matter of course appoint the president. If S. Silvester had himself been present at the council, it seems probable to me that he would have been appointed president; but in Silvester's absence one would expect that the choice of Constantine would fall upon Hosius. S. Athanasius says that Hosius was "of all men the most illustrious;"³ and the same great Father asks, "When was there a council held in which Hosius did not take the lead, and by right counsel convince every one?"⁴ When S. Athanasius is referring to the leading bishops of Christendom, he names Hosius before the pope. He says, "They have conspired against so many other bishops of high character, and have spared neither the great confessor Hosius, nor the Bishop of Rome, nor so many others from the Spains, and the Gauls, and Egypt, and Libya, and other countries."⁵ Professor Gwatkin calls Hosius "the patriarch of Christendom."⁶ Moreover, he was Constantine's chief adviser in ecclesiastical matters. When the Emperor wished to facilitate the manumission of slaves by Christians, he addressed his edict to Hosius,⁷ as being the representative bishop of his time. When the Arian disturbance was first brought before the notice

¹ *Ep.* xciii. *ad Synodum*, P. L., liv. 937.

² Cf. *Ep.* xxxiii., quoted on p. 168.

³ S. Athan. *Apol. de Fuga*, § 5.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, § 9.

⁷ Cf. *Cod. Theod.*, iv. 7. 1.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁶ *Studies of Arianism*, p. 147.

of Constantine, he sent "*e latere suo*"¹ his faithful counsellor, Hosius, to do what he could in Egypt to pacify the disputants. A council was thereupon held in Alexandria, at which Hosius appears to have presided, as may be gathered from two letters written by the clergy of the Mareotis. In the first of these letters, dated September 8, 335, the writers, speaking of the pseudo-bishop Colluthus, say, "He was ordered by a whole council, by Hosius and the bishops that were with him, to take the place of a presbyter, as he was before."² In the other letter, speaking of the pseudo-presbyter Ischyrras, they say, "He was deposed in the presence of our Father Hosius at the council which assembled at Alexandria."³ This Council of Alexandria was held in 324, the year before the Council of Nicaea. It would seem that Hosius took precedence of S. Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria, even in his own city. This reversal of the usual order no doubt resulted from the fact that Hosius held a commission from the Emperor. There is not the smallest reason for supposing that he held any commission from the pope on this occasion. As the Franciscan, Pagi, rightly says, "Hosius was not sent to Alexandria as legate by the Roman pontiff, Silvester, but by Constantine. . . . Nor is it any argument to the contrary that Hosius convoked the Alexandrine Synod and presided over it. For it is probable that he presided over that synod, because all the bishops of Egypt, and at their head Alexander himself, the Patriarch of Alexandria, offered to him the post of honour. For they would make no difficulty about offering this honour to a most celebrated man, sent by the Emperor and very dear to him, who had been constituted by him the arbiter of peace between Alexander and Arius."⁴ In writing thus Pagi shows that he has grasped the point of view from which Catholics of the fourth century would regard such a matter. His words are the words of candour and common sense.

To any one who realizes Hosius' extraordinary position in the Church, there is no difficulty in supposing that, as he presided at Alexandria in 324 on account of his relation to the Emperor, so he similarly presided in 325 at Nicaea in virtue of an imperial commission. Later on again, in 343, he presided at Sardica, having evidently received his appointment to preside from Constans. Both at Nicaea and at Sardica he took precedence of the papal legates. The signatures at Nicaea run thus in the oldest Latin translations—

"Osius, episcopus civitatis Cordouensis provinciae Hispaniae dixit :
'Sic credo sicut supra scriptum est.'

Victor et Vincentius, presbiteri urbis Romae [pro venerabili viro
papa episcopo nostro subscripsimus : 'Ita credentes sicut supra
scriptum est']"⁵

¹ See De Valois' Latin translation of Sozomen (*H. E.*, i. 16).

² Cf. S. Athan. *Apol. contr. Arian.*, § 76.

³ *Op. cit.*, § 74.

⁴ Pagi, *Critica*, ad ann. 318, § xix., edit. 1727, i. 390.

⁵ Cf. *Ecl. Occident. Monument. Juris Antiquiss.*, edit. C. H. Turner, Oxon., 1899, fascic. i. pp. 36, 37. I give the formula found in the Codex Veronensis Bibliothec. Capitul. lix. (57), of the sixth or seventh century, and of the Codex Corbeiensis, now Paris. lat. 12097, of the sixth century. I have added within brackets, to the subscription of the Roman presbyters, the supplement found in

Then follow the names of the other bishops, arranged according to their provinces, beginning with S. Alexander of Alexandria.

As regards the Council of Sardica, which was summoned as an Ecumenical Council, S. Athanasius gives the order of the bishops who signed the encyclical letter thus—

“ Hosius of Spain ;
Julius of Rome, by his presbyters, Archidamus and Philoxenus ;
Protogenes of Sardica,”¹ etc.

S. Athanasius describes the Sardican assembly as “the holy council, of which the great Hosius was president.”²

It is obvious from the wording of the signatures that neither at Nicaea nor at Sardica did Hosius act as a representative of the pope. If he had represented him, and if the pope had been regarded as the monarch of the Church, Hosius must have mentioned his qualification as legate. At Sardica the first signature would have been, “Julius of Rome, by Hosius of Spain, and by the Roman presbyters, Archidamus and Philoxenus.”

The fact that the first and most illustrious of all the ecumenical councils was not presided over by papal legates, comes out very clearly in the references to that council made by some of the popes. When they enumerated the first four councils, the popes of the sixth and following centuries were accustomed to mention that the Council of Ephesus had S. Celestine and S. Cyril for its presidents, and that S. Leo presided by his legates over the Council of Chalcedon ; but they make no claim for any papal presidency, when they are speaking of the first two councils, that is to say, of the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople. To give some examples : Pope Vigilius, in his encyclical letter of the 5th of February, 552, addressed to “the whole people of God,” says, “Therefore let all men know that we preach, hold, and defend that faith which, having been delivered by the apostles and inviolably guarded by their successors, the venerable Nicene Synod of 318 Fathers receiving by the revelation of the Holy Ghost gathered up into a creed : and afterwards three other holy synods, to wit the Constantinopolitan Synod of 150 Fathers, held in the time of Theodosius the elder of pious memory, and the first Synod of Ephesus, over which our predecessor, Pope Celestine of blessed memory, and Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, presided, and lastly

the Codex Ingilrami, now Vatic. Regin. 1997, and in the various *codices* of the *Collectio Quesnelliana*. The earliest of the MSS. containing the supplement are of the ninth or tenth century. Mr. Turner gives six main forms of the subscriptions of Hosius and of the Roman presbyters. These six forms represent the evidence of twenty-five *codices*. In none of them is there any reference to any legatine status in Hosius. The title, “presbiteri urbis Romae,” given to Victor and Vincentius in all the forms, speaks for itself. Presbyters could of course only sign, as representing their bishop. However, some later scribes thought it necessary to add an express assertion of the legatine status of the two presbyters. The evidence of the best Latin MSS. is entirely borne out by the passage which is quoted by Socrates (*H. E.*, i. 13) from the lost *Synodicon* of S. Athanasius. Compare also the restitution of the Greek text of the list, given by Gelzer, Hilgenfeld, and Cuntz, in their *Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina*.

¹ *Apol. contr. Arian.*, § 50.

² *Hist. Arian.*, § 16.

the Chalcedonian Synod of 630 Fathers, which met in the time of the Emperor Marcian of pious memory, and over which our predecessor of holy memory, Pope Leo, presided by his legates and representatives, these three synods . . . declaring the same faith in one and the same sense and spirit most widely propagated it."¹ The same sentence occurs almost word for word in the first of the three letters, addressed by Pope Pelagius II. to Elias of Aquileia and to the other bishops of Histria.² The same details in regard to the presidency of the first four Ecumenical Councils may be observed in the second of the three professions of faith which were subscribed by the Roman pontiffs on the occasion of their consecration to the see of Rome, to be found in the *Liber Diurnus*.³ It is evident that the tradition of the Church of Rome was that, whereas S. Celestine (by his legates) shared with S. Cyril in the presidency at Ephesus, and whereas S. Leo presided (by his legates) alone at Chalcedon, S. Silvester did not preside either personally or by his legates at Nicaea. If Hosius had presided at Nicaea in virtue of a commission from S. Silvester, we may be sure that the fact would not have been forgotten at Rome. I submit that the case is as clear as it is possible for a case to be. It is difficult to understand how, in the face of such a crushing fact, Roman theologians and controversialists can persist in maintaining that the pope, in the time of the Council of Nicaea, was the divinely appointed monarch of the Church.

APPENDIX E.

The Canons of Sardica and the Eastern Church (see note 3 on pp. 143, 144).

ON p. 143 I have said that the canons of Sardica, which dealt with appeals to Rome, "were never received in the East in such sense as to be applicable, without radical modification, to the East." As I regard the canons of Sardica about appeals as one of the most convincing proofs of the falseness of the Ultramontane theory of the papacy, I have no controversial interest to serve in making the statement which I have just quoted. If I adhere to that statement in spite of what Dr. Rivington has written on the subject,⁴ it is because the facts of the case compel me to do so.

I think that it will perhaps be admitted that in the early part of the sixth century the canons of Sardica were not received by the whole of the East. This comes out in a letter written by the canonist, Dionysius Exiguus, to Pope Hormisdas who sat from 514 to 523. At the request of Hormisdas, Dionysius had amended the Latin translation of the Greek canons, which he had made a few years earlier. He now published the original Greek and the improved Latin version in parallel columns, and he prefixed a prefatory letter addressed to the pope. In the course of this letter he says that he has in this new translation left out the canons of the apostles, and of the Council of Sardica, and of the

¹ *P. L.*, lxi. 56.

³ *P. L.*, cv. 46-48.

² Cf. *P. L.*, lxxii. 708.

⁴ See *Prim. Church*, pp. 469, 470.

African province, *because they are not received by the Church as a whole.*¹ Now, the Sardican canons were undoubtedly received at Rome and in many parts of the West, and presumably also in Egypt, and probably also in Cyprus and Arabia.² We may gather from what Dionysius says that there were other parts of the East,³ in which they were not received.⁴ Probably they were ignored in the patriarchates of Constantinople and Antioch, if not also in that of Jerusalem. We know from the letter prefixed to the second edition of Dionysius' first translation of the canons, that they were not contained in the Greek codex, which he used when making that translation. The Sardican canons were inserted in the two editions of that first translation, Dionysius obtaining them from Latin manuscripts.⁵

Copies of that first translation must have found their way to Constantinople after the reunion of the Constantinopolitan and Roman churches, in 519. And it is not at all improbable that it was in consequence of their familiarity with Dionysius' work that the idea of incorporating the Sardican canons into their own code suggested itself to the Greek lawyers and divines.⁶ Certain it is that at some time before the middle of the sixth century a collection containing the canons of ten councils was put together; and among the ten the Council of Sardica found a place. That collection of the canons of the ten councils formed the basis of the codified arrangement of canons, grouped under fifty headings, which was made by John Scholasticus, a priest of Antioch, not long after the year 556; and in John's preface⁷ he implies that an earlier arrangement of the canons of the same ten councils, codified under sixty headings, had been made by some previous canonist. The Ballerini seem to fix on the year 550 as being approximately the date of this earlier work.⁸ The publication of these collections and codified

¹ "Canones autem, qui dicuntur Apostolorum, et Serdicensis concilii atque Africanæ provinciae, quos non admisit universitas, ego quoque in hoc opere præternisi." (See Maassen's *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des Canonischen Rechts*, edit. 1870, tom. i. p. 965.)

² See p. 176, n. 2.

³ Dionysius would be more familiar with the practice of Constantinople than with that of Gaul or Britain.

⁴ In the Freisingen Collection there is a note referring to the Sardican canons, which is thus worded: "Item quae apud Graecos non habentur, sed apud Latinos tantum inveniuntur." See Maassen (*Op. cit.*, p. 482). The Freisingen Collection was probably in process of formation during the fifth century (compare p. 499).

⁵ See Maassen (*Op. cit.*, i. 962).

⁶ There can be no question that towards the end of the sixth century the Dionysian code was known in the imperial city. A Nomocanon was composed in the early years of the reign of Tiberius II., that is to say, soon after 578, which forms the basis of Photius' Nomocanon (see Montreuil's *Histoire du Droit Byzantin*, edit. 1843, tom. i. p. 230). It seems that it was the author of this document who first inserted the African canons into a Greek code. That author, who may very probably have been the great jurist Julianus (see Montreuil, *Op. cit.*, pp. 298-300), accepted the selection of African canons made by Dionysius, and translated them into Greek. Cf. Biener, *De Collectionibus Canonum*, edit. 1827, p. 19.

⁷ Voelli et Justelli *Bibliothec. Jur. Canon. Vet.*, edit. 1661, tom. ii. pp. 499-501.

⁸ See their dissertation, *De Antiq. Collection. et Collector. Canonum*, pars i. cap. ii. § 7, P. L., lvi. 23.

arrangements would have the effect of bringing the canons of Sardica to the knowledge of the Eastern churches. These works, however, were the compilations of private canonists, and had as yet no public authority.¹ But in 565 John Scholasticus was intruded schismatically by the Emperor Justinian into the see of Constantinople, and he retained possession of that see for more than twelve years, until his death in 577, when S. Eutychius, the canonical patriarch, was restored. The authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople was very great, and there can be little doubt that during John's occupancy of the see his code would be in great request, and copies of it would be largely multiplied. Still, I am not aware that there is any proof that it was authorized at that time by any synod, or that it received any other recognition which would amount to a public reception of it as the official code of the Eastern Church.

The final acceptance of the canons contained in the work of John Scholasticus was accomplished by the action of the council *in Trullo*, which was held in 691 or 692, at Constantinople. The second canon of that council² gives a list of the synods and Fathers, the recognition of whose canons and canonical epistles, as included in the code of Eastern ecclesiastical law, was now by the enactment of that very canon ratified. The order in which the synods are mentioned shows at what a comparatively late date the canons of Sardica began to attract attention in the East. The canons of Sardica and of Carthage are coupled together and are placed after the canons of Chalcedon; whereas the local Eastern synods of the fourth century, some of which were later than the Council of Sardica, intervene between the first and the second of the Ecumenical Councils, the list being headed by the Council of Nicaea on account of its super-eminent dignity.

But the question still remains to be considered—Did the reception of the Sardican canons into the Eastern code mean that the Eastern Church intended henceforth to put into practice the guarded system of quasi-appeals to Rome, which was laid down in the third, fourth, and fifth of those canons? Undoubtedly a negative answer must be returned to that question. When a local church authorizes a code containing a number of old canons, many of which were originally enacted either at times when or in places where the details of ecclesiastical discipline differed widely from the discipline of the church which is now receiving the code, it is normally to be understood that the canons are received in so far as they fit in with the actual discipline of the church which is receiving them. When the Church of Rome received and made her own the code compiled by Dionysius Exiguus,³ it must not for a moment be supposed

¹ *Op. cit.*, cap. vi. § 2, *P. L.*, lvi. 45.

² Cf. Coleti, vii. 1344, 1345.

³ Cassiodorus, the celebrated contemporary of Dionysius, speaking of that illustrious man's translation of the canons, adds, "Quos hodie usu celeberrimo ecclesia Romana complectitur" (*De Instit. Div. Lit.*, cap. 23, *P. L.*, lxx. 1137). Pope Adrian I. sent a copy of the Dionysian Collection to Charles the Great, prefixing to it some acrostich verses, the last of which runs thus: "A lege nunquam discede, haec observans statuta" (*cf. P. L.*, xcvi. 1241). Pope Leo IV., writing to the bishops of Brittany, enumerates the contents of the two Dionysian collections of canons and decretals, and says that he uses them "in omnibus ecclesiasticis judiciis" (*Leonis IV. Ep. viii., ad Episcopos Britanniae, P. L.*, cxv. 668, 669).

that she meant to revolutionize her immemorial discipline in regard to those many important points in which that discipline differed from the new code. For example, the first fifty of the Apostolical Canons form part of the Dionysian code, and the sixth of those canons threatens excommunication against any bishop or priest who should put away his wife under pretence of religion.¹ Assuredly Rome never adopted the provisions of that canon, though the canon forms part of a code which she did adopt. Similarly, in the forty-sixth and forty-seventh of the Apostolical Canons heretical baptism is treated as invalid,² whereas the Roman Church from very early times strenuously maintained its validity. Again, the Dionysian code includes the canons of Ancyra, and the tenth of those canons allows a deacon to marry after his ordination, if before his ordination he gave notice to his bishop that he did not intend to bind himself to celibacy.³ That discipline was never accepted at Rome. I will give one more instance. The canons of Chalcedon are to be found in the code of Dionysius; and in the last clause of the ninth Chalcedonian canon it is laid down that,⁴ "if a bishop or clerk has a difference with the metropolitan of his province, he may choose either the exarch of the diocese⁵ or the see of imperial Constantinople, and accept judgement from him or from it." Assuredly Rome, in accepting the Dionysian code, had no intention of allowing Sardinian bishops, who might quarrel with their metropolitan at Calaris, to ignore the tribunal of the Roman pontiff, and to cite their archbishop before the court of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

I have, I hope, made it evident that the reception of a code as authoritative does not involve the reception of all the provisions of all the canons contained in the code.

As regards the Sardican canons and the Eastern Church, it is absolutely certain that that church never intended to substitute the Sardican system of appeals to Rome in lieu of her own system of appeals to provincial and patriarchal synods, as set forth in various canons which were just as much part of her code as were the canons of Sardica. Photius, at the end of the *prolegomena* to his Nomocanon, points out that the Councils of Sardica and Carthage have a place in the Eastern code, which does not agree with their chronological order; and he gives as the reason for this abnormal position the fact that those councils defined many things which had to do with special places and regions, or which

¹ See Hefele, i. 460, E. tr.

² *Ibid.*, i. 477, 478, E. tr.

³ *Ibid.*, i. 210, E. tr.; and *P. L.*, lxxvii. 153.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iii. 394, E. tr.; and *P. L.*, lxxvii. 173.

⁵ The exarch of the diocese means here the superior metropolitan, whether called patriarch or exarch, of the group of provinces, to which the bishop or clerk belongs. Pope Nicholas I., by an absurd perversion of the meaning of the words, interprets the expression "exarch of the diocese" so as to make it in all cases denote the Roman pope (cf. Nicolai i. *Ep.* lxxxvi., *ad Michaelem Imperatorem*, *P. L.*, cxix. 944, 945; and *Ep.* lxxv., *ad Universos Episcopos Galliae*, *P. L.*, cxix. 900). It is not for a moment to be supposed that this perversion of the sense had been thought of, when the see of Rome first began to make use of Dionysius' compilation, more than three hundred years before the time of Nicholas.

were decreed for the sake of the provinces of the West.¹ The fact is certain, though I doubt whether it constitutes the true reason of the abnormal order. Whether this be so or not, it is impossible to point out any trace of the Sardican system of limited appeals to Rome having been ever carried out in the East; and the Council *in Trullo*, with its strong anti-Roman bias, would have been the last council in the world to ratify any attempt to substitute that system for the totally different system which had grown up in the East.

M^r. Duchesne sums up very tersely what I have tried to set forth at length. He says, "Le concile de Sardique n'avait été admis que par une fraction de l'Église grecque, par l'épiscopat égyptien.² Il entra plus tard dans les collections canoniques byzantines; mais il ne faut pas croire que toutes les lois conciliaires insérées dans un recueil de droit ecclésiastique aient force de loi pour les pays où ces recueils circulent."³

I take this opportunity of saying that I have removed from the note on p. 153 the reference to Photius' statement about the non-reception of

¹ Cf. Voelli et Justelli, *Bibliothec. Jur. Canon. Vet.*, edit. 1661, tom. ii. p. 795. Similarly, the anonymous compiler of the Nomocanon, which appeared in the reign of Tiberius, speaking in his preface of the African canons which he was bringing for the first time to the knowledge of the Greek Church, dwells on the fact that they are not all capable of application to the Church in the East (cf. Voell. et Justell., *Bibliothec.*, tom. ii. p. 790). It must be noted that this anonymous compiler's preface is quoted at length by Photius, in the preface to his edition of the Nomocanon, and forms, in fact, the first section of that preface.

² Perhaps the bishops of Cyprus in the time of S. Epiphanius and the bishops of the province of Arabia at the same epoch may have also accepted the Sardican canons. The Arabians and Cypriots, no less than the Egyptians, sided with Paulinus against S. Flavian (Sozomen., vii. 11), and we can hardly doubt that Paulinus accepted with fervour everything Sardican. On the occasion of the contest between Badagius and Agapius, rival claimants of the see of Bostra, the Arabian bishops seem to have acted on the rules laid down at Sardica about quasi-appeals to Rome. This episode took place during the episcopate of Siricius at Rome and of Theophilus at Alexandria. Siricius very properly refrained from hearing the appeal at Rome, and arranged for it to be heard by Theophilus of Alexandria. Theophilus brought it before a council of bishops, who had come together for the baptism of Rufinus, a prefect of the praetorium, and for the consecration of the basilica which Rufinus had built near Chalcedon. The council was held in September, 394. An account of this solitary instance of action being taken in the East on the lines of the Sardican canons about quasi-appeals to Rome is preserved in a fragment of a memorandum drawn up by the Roman deacon, Pelagius, afterwards pope, against the decisions of the fifth Ecumenical Council (see an article by Duchesne, in the *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne* for December, 1885, pp. 280-284). The fact that the appeal came from Arabia, and that it was the Egyptian patriarch who was commissioned to hear it, explains a proceeding which would otherwise have been incomprehensible. The appeal would naturally have been made from Arabia to Antioch. But at the time when the appeal must, in fact, have gone from Arabia to Rome, viz. in 392 or 393, Evagrius, the successor of Paulinus at Antioch, was in communion neither with Rome nor with Alexandria, and he would therefore have had no bishops in his communion who could sit with him to hear an appeal. The state of things was quite exceptional. It may be added that one of the very few Eastern bishops, who were present at the Council of Sardica, was S. Asterius, Bishop of Petra, in Arabia (cf. S. Athan. *Apol. contr. Arian.* § 48, et *Tom. ad Antiochenos*, § 10). He would bring back or send the Sardican canons to his own country.

³ Duchesne, *Églises Séparées*, p. 204.

the canons of Sardica in the Church of Constantinople,¹ not because I am at all convinced that the statement was unjustifiable, but because the refutation of Dr. Rivington's criticisms of it would take up more space than I can afford, and the thesis, which I was illustrating in that note and am defending in this appendix, in no way depends on the accuracy of the statement made by Photius.

¹ Cf. Photii, *Epistolarum*, lib. i. ep. i. *ad Nicolaum*, P. G., cii. 600, 601.

LECTURE V.

THE GROWTH OF THE PAPAL POWER DURING THE SIXTY YEARS WHICH FOLLOWED THE DEATH OF DAMASUS.

IN my last lecture I tried to show you how the popes began, in the middle of the fourth century, to acquire jurisdiction outside the limits of Italy. We saw that the Council of Sardica gave to them a strictly limited power of receiving appeals in the case of deposed bishops. But as the canons of Sardica were for a long while neither received nor known in the greater part of the East, and were only received in certain parts of the West, the jurisdiction derived from the Sardican canons did not go very far. But then we saw how, during the pontificate of Damasus, the Emperors Valentinian and Gratian conferred on the pope a very large measure of jurisdiction over the bishops of the whole Western Empire. This jurisdiction, received from the Emperors, had no proper canonical basis, but it was felt to be a power with which the Western churches had to reckon; because the pope, when acting in accordance with the provisions of the imperial constitutions, was able to enforce his authority upon contumacious bishops by the help of the secular magistrates. The result of this was to give a certain legally authoritative character to all the official acts of the popes, and amongst those acts to the letters¹ which they from time to time sent out in response to the requests for advice which came to them from the provinces. From very early times it had been customary in the West to consult the see of Rome as being the only Western apostolic see. There was a similar custom in the East of consulting the various Eastern apostolic sees. Whether in the East or in the West, the apostolic sees were consulted, because they were presumed to have retained in special purity the original deposit of tradition, which they had received from the apostles. The answers which arrived from Rome or from other apostolic

¹ The imperial constitutions made the pope a court of final appeal for the bishops of the West, and the normal court of first instance for the metropolitans of the West, but they did not define the law which he was to administer. This omission left it free to the popes to make their own law, and they were able to give to their decretal letters a force equivalent to that of the canons.

sees were received with great respect, although it was not supposed that they had the force of law. Sometimes it would happen that some specially valuable letter written by an occupant of one of the great sees, or even occasionally by some bishop of an inferior see who might be in high repute for sanctity and learning, would be received by some council as stating accurately the law or custom of the Church, and such a letter would, by the action of the council, become a canonically authoritative document. This happened not infrequently in the East. For example, the Church in the East accepted as of binding authority what were called the canonical epistles of S. Denys the Great of Alexandria, of S. Gregory the Wonder-worker of Neocaesarea, of S. Peter and of S. Athanasius, both of Alexandria, of S. Basil of Caesarea, of S. Gregory of Nyssa, of S. Gregory of Nazianzus, of S. Amphilochius of Iconium, of Timothy, of Theophilus, and of S. Cyril, all of Alexandria, and of S. Gennadius of Constantinople.¹ In the West, although the popes must often have written letters of advice in reply to inquiries, we do not find that any of their letters were accepted as having legal force, until we come to the letters of Siricius (who followed Damasus) and his successors. No doubt Pope Stephen had tried, in the time of S. Cyprian, to legislate for the whole Church, by means of letters, on the subject of the baptism of heretics; but he failed. However, in the time of Siricius the pope had become, by the action of the State, a great potentate in the West, and some of the Western provincial churches were prepared to accept his replies to their inquiries as having force of law.² Under these altered circumstances the popes not unnaturally assumed a more authoritative tone. They no longer gave mere advice, but they laid down the law, and in some cases threatened bishops, who should disobey, with the penalty of being cut off from the communion of the Roman Church. They still professed, however, not to be making new law,³ but to be authoritatively declaring what was the

¹ See the second canon of the Council *in Trullo* (Coleti, *Concilia*, vii. 1345).

² But it was not until the time of S. Caesarius of Arles (A.D. 503-543) that papal decretals were regarded by the Gallican Church as having a general authority, and as being on a line with the canons (see the Abbé Malnory's *Saint Césaire*, pp. 51, 107). The Ballerini have shown (*De Antiq. Collection. et Collector. Canonum*, pars ii. cap. i. § ii. n. 9, *P. L.*, lvi. 68, 69) that in the suburbicarian regions papal decretals were treated as on a level with canons in the time of Pope Celestine (A.D. 422-432); but in these regions the popes' legislative authority must have been recognized long before S. Celestine.

³ Compare the letter of Pope Innocent I. (A.D. 402-417) to Victricius of Rouen (Coleti, iii. 8): "Non quo nova praecepta aliqua imperentur, sed ea, quae per desideriam aliquorum neglecta sunt, ab omnibus observari cupiamus." Pope Innocent has copied this sentence, almost word for word, from the letter of his predecessor Siricius to the bishops of Africa (Coleti, ii. 1225).

already existing law. But often, under cover of declaring the old law, they really made new law. For example, old laws might belong to different categories. Some laws would be general laws binding the whole Church, or at any rate binding the whole West, others would be local laws or customs received only at Rome and in the suburbicarian circumscription. The popes, writing to distant provinces in Spain, Gaul, or elsewhere, might refer to local Italian customs as old laws, and set them forth as binding on distant churches,¹ and thus, by the authority of their decretal epistle, make them to become law in places where hitherto they had had no canonical force.

But it must be observed that this legislative or quasi-legislative action of the popes through decretal epistles was confined to the West. It was a very rare thing for any Eastern prelate to write to Rome such letters of inquiry on matters of discipline as often came from Western churches. I do remember one such case. Alexander, Bishop of Antioch, wrote a letter of inquiry to Pope Innocent I. (*circa* 415); and Innocent sent an answer, but it never became part of the Eastern canon law. On the contrary, one very important portion of Innocent's letter, in which he laid down that the Bishop of Antioch ought to have patriarchal jurisdiction over the bishops of Cyprus, was practically annulled, if it ever had any force, by the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus held sixteen years afterwards, which declared that, if the statement of facts contained in the petition of the bishops of Cyprus was correct, they were to remain free, and (to use the technical expression) autocephalous.² As may be supposed, the decision of the council prevailed over that of the pope; although that is hardly an accurate way of stating the case, for the pope's decretal could have had no legal or canonical force in the East; and moreover it avowedly proceeded upon an *ex parte* statement.³

It follows, from what I have said, that the quasi-legislative authority of Rome, which was exercised after the time of Damasus through the papal decretals, being an authority

¹ Compare the letter of Pope Innocent I. to Decentius of Eugubium, in which he says that the churches throughout Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the adjacent islands ought to follow the customs of the Roman Church. He proceeds to give a number of liturgical and ritual directions, *e.g.* as to the point in the altar service, when the kiss of peace is to be given, and the like. He gives the Roman rule, and asserts that the Western churches ought to conform themselves to it (*cf.* Coleti, iii. 4). That was doubtless the papal view, but it was not carried out. The traditions of Gaul, Spain, and even of North Italy, were entirely opposed to such liturgical conformity. See Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, chap. iii. pp. 81-99, *et passim*.

² The Church of Cyprus remains autocephalous to this day (see Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 26).

³ See Dr. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 169.

which was only received in the West, was part of the pope's *patriarchal* power. It was not a power belonging to his primatial position with reference to the whole Church. The fact is, that as primate of the whole Church he had no jurisdiction, but only honour and influence: as State-made Patriarch of the West he had a jurisdiction derived from the Emperor: in those Western provinces, where the canons of Sardica were received, he had, over and above his State-given authority, a very limited jurisdiction derived from the synodical action of the Church: and, finally, in the suburbicarian churches he had a very full and commanding metropolitan jurisdiction derived from ancient custom—that is to say, if we go to the bottom of the matter, derived from the delegation or concession of the bishops of Central and Southern Italy, and regulated and confirmed, as time went on, by the canons of councils.

As we have seen, it was in the time of Damasus that the State made the pope Patriarch of the West, and it was in the time of Damasus' successor Siricius that the first decretal epistle, having force of law anywhere outside the suburbicarian region, was issued. It was addressed to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona in Spain. That letter to Himerius was the beginning of the long line of the genuine papal decretals. In later ages, when it was believed that the popes had always from the beginning been monarchs of the Church, men must have thought it strange that the decretals should begin with Siricius. And so in the ninth century the pseudo-Isidore forged decretals, which he attributed to the earlier popes, from S. Clement of Rome, who, according to the old mistake, was supposed to be S. Peter's immediate successor, onwards. But I must not be tempted into discoursing now about the forged decretals. If we fix our attention on the genuine decretals, we find that Pope Siricius and his successors were, as it would seem, ashamed to base their asserted legislative authority on the constitutions of the Emperors. As I intimated in my last lecture, they laid stress on their vague claim to be successors of S. Peter in his chair; and in their decretals they began to speak in a semi-mystical way of S. Peter living on in them, and acting and judging and defining through them. Let me give a few examples. Pope Siricius, in his first decretal to Himerius, says, "We bear the burdens of all who are heavily laden; or rather the blessed Apostle Peter bears them in us; for he, as we trust, in all things protects and defends us who are the heirs of his government."¹ Similarly, Xystus III., who became pope about thirty-four years after the death of Siricius (viz. in A.D. 432), says in one of his letters that "the blessed

¹ Coleti, *Concilia*, ii. 1213.

Peter in his successors has delivered that which he received." ¹ Thus the popes of that age taught that S. Peter was in some sense in them, his successors, bearing the burdens of the heavily laden, and delivering in them and through them the deposit of the faith which he had originally received. And this doctrine about S. Peter living and acting in the popes, which was being put forth by the popes, was naturally repeated by papal legates and by other persons closely connected with the Roman see. Thus we find Philip, one of the papal legates at the Council of Ephesus, saying that "the most blessed Peter, the prince and head of the apostles, . . . up to the present time and always lives and judges in his successors." ² We must certainly say that all this is new doctrine; new and therefore false; an attempt to give a religious sanction to the great position which the Roman pontiffs had acquired mainly through the legislative action of the State. It would be easy to quote further illustrations of the increasing tendency to make large and baseless claims on behalf of the Roman see, which may be found in the letters of Pope Innocent (402-417), Pope Zosimus (417-418), Pope Boniface (418-422), and their successors; but what I have said under this head is, I think, sufficient. One more point, however, ought to be noticed. Practically these popes of the early part of the fifth century did not attempt to legislate for the East, or to exercise in any specially papal way jurisdiction over it. They probably knew that their claims would be ignored or repudiated. They pressed their new theories on the West, especially on those parts of the West which lay outside the suburbicarian provinces, and which had only recently been brought within their jurisdiction by the action of the State. They asserted their new claims on Gaul, and on Illyricum, and on Spain, and on Africa. Having no valid ground for this new jurisdiction of a religious or ecclesiastical character, all that they could do was to refer perpetually to S. Peter, and to the rights which they inherited from him. But of course, any divinely instituted rights coming to the popes from S. Peter as primate, if they existed at all, would be universal in their range. The popes were thus forced to lay down principles which applied to both East and West, though for the present they did not urge them on the East. They were building up a Western patriarchate; but the arguments which they used, if they were sound, really pointed to a universal patriarchate—in other words, to an ecumenical papacy. As time went on, they must have felt this; and when the opportunity presented itself in the time

¹ Coleti, iii. 1697.

² *Ibid.*, iii. 1153.

of S. Leo, and still more in the time of S. Leo's successors,¹ the claim to ecumenical jurisdiction came openly to the front.

But how did the Western provinces accept the new patriarchal yoke which was being pressed upon them? Naturally, the way in which it was received varied according to circumstances. Apparently, the patriarchal authority of Rome was received with least opposition in Eastern Illyricum, the most eastern division of the West.² On the other hand, it met with the sturdiest rejection in Africa. The great Church of North Africa was at the height of its glory, and, one may add, of its sanctity. It had splendid traditions reaching back to the time of S. Cyprian and to the still earlier times of the second century. In the beginning of the fifth century, it was illuminated by the combined holiness and genius of S. Augustine. And S. Augustine was but one, although the greatest, among a number of saints; as, for example, to name two of them, S. Aurelius of Carthage and S. Alypius of Tagaste. The African Church had from early times been accustomed to act as one body under the leadership of the Bishop of Carthage. But the Bishop of Carthage, though leader, had no exaggerated authority. His relation to the African bishops was very different from the relation of the Bishop of Alexandria to the Egyptian bishops, and from the relation of the Bishop of Rome to the suburbicarian bishops. Everything in Africa seemed to bear on it the stamp of primitive freedom. Consequently, the African bishops were not at all disposed to accept meekly the new claims which were being put forth by the popes. I might illustrate this statement by referring to various episodes which occurred during the course of the Pelagian controversy, but for my present purpose I prefer to speak of the case of Apiarius.

Apiarius was a priest of the Church of Sicca, a city situated in what was called the proconsular province, of which Carthage was the metropolis. He fell into certain sins—we are not told the details in regard to them—and he was deposed and excommunicated, perhaps with some informality, either in the latter part of the year 417 or early

¹ *E.g.* Felix III., Gelasius, Symmachus, and Hormisdas.

² Ecclesiastically, Eastern Illyricum belonged to the West. Even there the bishops protested, when the popes first began to receive appeals from the decisions of the local synods. In the time of Pope Innocent I. (*circa* 414) the Macedonian bishops objected to the pope rehearing the cases of Bubalius and Taurianus, who had been condemned in Macedonia: see the eighteenth epistle of Innocent in Dom Coustant's collection of the Letters of the Roman pontiffs (i. 841, 842). Dom Coustant, commenting on the words of Innocent, says, "Hence we may conclude that Bubalius and Taurianus, having been judged by the Macedonians, had appealed to the apostolic see, and that the Macedonians were indignant that their judgement should be reviewed."

in 418, by Urban, Bishop of Sicca, who had been a pupil of S. Augustine. Apiarius appealed from his bishop to Pope Zosimus.¹ Probably he knew that, if he appealed to the provincial synod, the witnesses of his crimes would be forthcoming, and his condemnation would undoubtedly be ratified. He therefore appealed² to distant Rome. Cardinal Baronius tells us³ that Zosimus received the appeal, and admitted Apiarius to communion, and restored him to the exercise of his priestly functions. Apparently, Apiarius, when he was in Rome, made various counter-accusations against his bishop Urban, poisoning thereby the mind of Pope Zosimus. Whereupon Zosimus sent three legates, Faustinus, Bishop of Potentia in the March of Ancona, and two Roman priests, Philip and Asellus. After their arrival in Africa a council was held in the autumn, either at Carthage, as is generally supposed, or at Caesarea in Mauritania Caesariensis, as Van Espen holds.⁴ At this council the Roman legates were present. They had brought with them a *commonitorium* from the pope, in which they were charged to treat with the African bishops on four points. They were to request (1) that the African bishops should be allowed to appeal to the Roman see; (2) that bishops should not go so often to the imperial court; (3) that priests and deacons, if rashly excommunicated by their bishop, should be allowed to appeal to the neighbouring bishops; (4) that Bishop Urban of Sicca should be excommunicated or even sent to Rome, if he did not amend his ways. They quoted, in support of the first point, the fifth (*al.* seventh) canon of Sardica, which, as I showed in a previous lecture, granted a very limited right of appeal to Rome. But the legates did not quote it as a canon of Sardica, but as a canon of the Ecu- menical Council of Nicaea.⁵ The canons of Sardica were not

¹ Apiarius seems to have been the first African priest of his time who ventured to appeal, on a disciplinary question, from an African synod to Rome. He may have been emboldened to take this step by the apparently successful result of the appeals of the Briton Pelagius and of the Irishman Coelestius, on a doctrinal question, to Pope Zosimus. It is true that in 418 the pope condemned those heretics, but in the autumn of 417 he seemed to be taking their side. Moreover, in consequence of Zosimus' favourable attitude towards Pelagius and Coelestius, a very critical state of tension existed between the Churches of Africa and Rome, which lasted from October, 417, to May, 418. Apiarius may well have felt that an appeal to Rome from Africa at that particular time had every chance of success.

² The appeal must have been made before the great council of May, 418; compare p. 195.

³ *Annal. Eccl.*, s.a. 419, tom. v. pp. 463, 464, ed. 1648.

⁴ See Van Espen's *Dissertat. in Synodos Africanas*, § x. art. ii., *Op. Posthum.*, ed. 1755, pp. 292-294. For my own part, I believe that this preliminary council was held at Carthage in November or December, 418, after S. Augustine's return from Mauritania.

⁵ The legates also quoted, in support of the third point, the fourteenth (*al.*

accepted in Africa as authoritative; and, in fact, although S. Gratus, Bishop of Carthage, had been there, all recollection of the true Council of Sardica seems to have completely passed away from the mind of the African Church.¹ But the Council of Nicaea was venerated in Africa as elsewhere, and its canons were received as authoritative. When the legates quoted the Sardican canon as if it were Nicene, the African bishops must have been thoroughly puzzled. They thought they knew the Nicene canons well, and this canon quoted by the legates, which allowed appeals to Rome, was completely new to them. It was not in the copy of the Nicene canons which Bishop Caecilian of Carthage, who had been present at the Council of Nicaea, had brought back with him to Africa;² nor in any of the other copies, whether in Greek or Latin, which were preserved in the archives of the Church of Carthage.³ However, the bishops took a most conciliatory course, and wrote to Zosimus, telling him that the canon quoted by his legates was not in their copies of the Nicene canons, but that they would provisionally consent to observe it until further investigation had cleared the matter up. It is not certain whether Zosimus ever received this letter, as he died in the latter part of December in that year, and was succeeded by Boniface.

On May 25 of the following year, 419, a plenary council, at which all the African provinces were represented, was held at Carthage, under the presidency of S. Aurelius, the bishop of that see. Next to S. Aurelius sat Valentinus, the Primate of Numidia. After him Faustinus, the papal chief legate. Then followed in due order all the African bishops who were present, 217 in number, including S. Augustine and S. Alypius. Last of all sat the two Roman priests, Philip and Asellus, the junior legates of the pope. The council determined, in

seventeenth) canon of Sardica; and as in the previous case, they attributed to the Council of Nicaea a canon which was really passed at Sardica.

¹ At a Council of Carthage, held soon after the year 343, the Bishop of Carthage, S. Gratus, referred to the Council of Sardica by name, and recalled the provisions of the fifteenth (*al.* nineteenth) Sardican canon (Coleti, ii. 749). But the only Council of Sardica known to S. Augustine in 397, when he wrote to Eleusius (*Ep.* xlv., *Opp.*, ii. 103), and in 406, when he wrote against Cresconius (*Contra Crescon.*, iii. 34, et iv. 44, *Opp.*, ix. 454, 509), was the Arianizing Council of Philippopolis. The reference to the Council of Sardica, in the report of the speech of Bishop Novatus, at the Council of Carthage, in May, 419 (Coleti, iii. 446), has evidently crept into the text from the margin.

² My own belief is that Bishop Caecilian brought back from Nicaea a Greek copy of the canons. Maassen holds, without sufficient reason as it seems to me, that a Latin version of the canons was made at Nicaea, a copy of which was brought to Carthage by Caecilian. Compare pp. 139, 434.

³ At the council held in May, 419, S. Alypius, speaking of the canons alleged by Faustinus, said, evidently with a twinkle in his eye, "When we inspected the Greek copies of this Nicene Synod, somehow or other, I know not why, we utterly failed to find them there" (Coleti, iii. 445).

spite of the protest of the legate Faustinus, that they would write to the Bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and ask them to send to Carthage authenticated copies of the Nicene canons, as preserved in the archives of their several churches, so that the question might be once for all settled whether the canon alleged by Pope Zosimus and his legates was really a genuine canon of Nicaea or not. They also determined to write to the new pope, Boniface, inviting him to make similar inquiries. Moreover, they ratified the action of the council held the year before, when Faustinus first arrived in Africa; and determined that provisionally they would act upon the canon alleged by the pope, which granted to bishops a restricted appeal from local synods to Rome; that, if on inquiry it should clearly appear that that canon was really Nicene, they would accept it absolutely, and act upon it in the future; but that, if it should appear that the pope had made some mistake, a council should be convoked which should decide what was to be done. As for Apiarius, he besought the council to grant him forgiveness; and then the legate Faustinus interceded for him; and so it was determined that he should be restored to communion and to the exercise of his priestly ministry, but should be required to remove out of the diocese of Sicca, where he had given much scandal. The council could not help observing that, even if the canons alleged by the legates were really Nicene and consequently binding in Africa, they gave no authority to the pope to summon bishops to Rome, nor to restore priests to communion in Rome after they had been excommunicated in their own diocese or province. Zosimus, while quoting the canons of Sardica to the Africans, had in no way observed them himself. The council, therefore, in its letter to Pope Boniface, writes as follows: "To the most blessed lord and honourable brother, Boniface; . . ." Then, after a summary of what had taken place, they continue, "We took care also to intimate last year by our letter to the same Zosimus, bishop of venerable memory, that we would for a short time permit these rules to be observed without any injury to him, until he had investigated the statutes of the Nicene Council. And now we request of your holiness to cause us to keep whatever was really ordained by the Fathers at Nicaea, and also to take care that those rules, which are written in the instructions brought by the legates, be really carried out by you in Italy;" and then they quote the words of the Sardican canons alleged by the legates. They go on to say, "These rules we have at all events inserted in the acts of our council until the arrival of the genuine copies of the Nicene Synod. And should they be there contained, as they

were enacted, and as they appear in the *commonitorium*, which was quoted in our council by the brethren sent from the apostolic see, and should they also be observed strictly by you in Italy, we could by no means be compelled to endure such treatment as we are unwilling to mention, or to suffer what is unendurable." In other words, the council means to say, "If your alleged canons are really Nicene, we will keep them, but we must beg that they be kept strictly by you also. If you do keep them, there will be no pretence of undoing our African sentences in Rome, as Zosimus professed to restore Apiarius; and there will be no claim to summon our bishops to Rome, as was threatened by Zosimus in regard to our brother Urban, Bishop of Sicca;¹ and there will be no sending of Roman legates to sit uninvited with our bishops to hear the appeals of presbyters. Such modes of action are unmentionable and unbearable."² Then remembering that Zosimus was now dead, and that Boniface was pope, they continue, "But we trust, by the mercy of our Lord God, that while *your* holiness presides over the Roman Church, we shall not have to endure such arrogance as that (*non sumus jam istum typhum passuri*); and that a course of proceeding will be maintained towards us such as ought to be observed, even without our having to speak about it."³ Such was the style in which this great council of more than two hundred bishops, under the guidance of such glorious saints as S. Augustine, S. Aurelius, and S. Alypius, thought that it was right and proper for them to address the pope. I leave you to consider whether any Roman Catholic synod would think of writing such a letter now. On the principles of the Vatican Council, they could not do it. On our Anglican principles, or rather on our Catholic principles, it would be the most natural thing in the world. How does this come about? It comes about, because S. Augustine and the African saints thought of the pope substantially as we should have thought of him, if, with our present views, we had lived in the fifth century.⁴ But the

¹ The African Fathers had copied out at full length in their letter, from Zosimus' *commonitorium*, the Sardican canons, which require that, in the case of an appeal to Rome, the rehearing shall take place, not at Rome, but in the country where the cause began; and which in the case of presbyters grant no appeal to Rome of any sort or kind.

² Zosimus seems to have been a disturber, not only of the African and Gallican churches, but also of his own local church at Rome. Mgr. Duchesne (*Fastes Épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, i. 106) says concerning this pope, "Son esprit inquiet, son humeur cassante, avaient tellement troublé le clergé Romain lui-même qu'un schisme éclata sur sa tombe." For his dealings with the Gallican Church, see note 2 on pp. 151, 152.

³ The whole letter is given by Coletti (iii. 528-530), and also by Migne (*P. L.*, xx. 752-756).

⁴ Of course the extravagant papalism of later times, and especially the decrees

modern Roman Catholics, who accept the Vatican Council, think of him in a totally different way. We are quite content to find ourselves, in such a matter, on S. Augustine's side.

Before we go on with the story, we ought to notice that the pope apparently did not venture to base his claims to receive appeals on any inherent right of his see, derived from S. Peter. It was all very well to do that when writing to simple-minded bishops in Illyricum or Spain, but when writing to Africa, he knew that he was dealing with bishops, some of whom were the most learned and able theologians then alive. To use Petrine arguments of the Roman sort, *when in controversy with them*, would be to run the risk of having the whole fallacy of those arguments exposed with all the force and persuasiveness of such a pen as S. Augustine's. Pope Zosimus no doubt felt that discretion was the better part of valour, and therefore humbly based his claim on the grant of the Church, as expressed in the canons which he alleged, and which he wrongly called Nicene. This highly discreet method of proceeding ought to be remembered. It is very characteristic. However, though in one sense the pope may have acted discreetly, his whole proceeding was so utterly un-Catholic, that it called forth from the African bishops a well-deserved rebuke. The pope's action, in their view, was "intolerable," "unmentionable," and the outcome of "arrogance;" and they do not hesitate to use these very plain expressions when reviewing the whole matter in a letter to Zosimus' successor. There is, of course, in all this no cause for surprise. It is what one would expect from such great saints.

But to return to our story. Towards the end of the year 419, replies from S. Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, and from S. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, arrived in Carthage. These two prelates sent correct copies of the Nicene canons, which were found to tally in substance with the copies already at Carthage.¹ Naturally the Sardican canons alleged by Rome were not among them. A council might have been convened at once to put an end to the provisional acceptance of the Sardican system of appeals. But apparently the African Church preferred to wait until a convenient opportunity for reopening the matter occurred. Nothing is more remarkable throughout this history than the wisdom and moderation of the great men who at that time guided the African Church. The fitting opportunity did not

of the Vatican Council, have forced us into a position into which S. Augustine was not forced.

¹ On the documents sent to Carthage by S. Cyril, which seem to be preserved in the Theodosian MS. at Verona [*Cod. Veron.*, lx. (58)], see the very interesting paper by Mr. C. H. Turner, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, which appeared in the *Guardian* for December 11, 1895, pp. 1921, 1922.

in their judgement present itself until about seven years had passed.¹ During that interval or parenthesis appeals to Rome from Africa were allowed in the case of bishops, in accordance with the agreement.² The matter was reopened in consequence of fresh scandals arising in connexion with Apiarius. Since his restoration to communion he had been living at Tabraca, in the proconsular province. Here he acted in such a way that the inhabitants were obliged to accuse him of enormous crimes, and he was cut off from communion. Instead of attempting to justify himself, he went off to Rome, pretending that he had appealed to the pope, although he certainly never did appeal in any formal way. Of course the African bishops would never have allowed a mere priest to appeal to Rome; for such an appeal was not allowed even by the canons of Sardica. Appeals to Rome by priests in disciplinary causes were unknown in Africa until Apiarius, in his previous trouble, had first led the way. The African Church had promptly taken measures to prevent the repetition of such an irregular proceeding,³ by passing a canon in the great council of May, 418, which concluded as follows: "Whoever appeals to a court on the other side of the sea [*i.e.* to Rome], may not again be received into communion by any one in Africa."⁴ It is therefore evident that on this second occasion Apiarius did not appeal in any formal way. Such a formal act would not have been allowed. He simply slunk off to Rome, and besought the pope to admit him to communion. By this time Boniface was dead, and Celestine

¹ Dom Coustant has well summarized (*P. L.*, l. 422, n.) Tillemont's argument in favour of the year 426 as being the probable date of the twentieth Carthaginian Council under Aurelius, the council which concluded the affair of Apiarius. The Ballerini (*De Antiq. Collection. et Collector.*, pars ii. cap. iii. § 9, n. 59, *P. L.*, lvi. 121) agree with Tillemont and Coustant.

² Tillemont (xiii. 865) has accounted satisfactorily for the prolongation of the agreement until 426.

³ Compare Hefele, ii. 463, Eng. trans.

⁴ Hefele's *Councils*, Eng. trans., ii. 461 (see also p. 463); and compare Ballerini's *Obs. in Dissert. v. Quesnell.*, pars i. cap. v. n. 21, *P. L.*, lv. 566. It is to be noted that the Ballerini and Hefele agree that it was the appeal of Apiarius which led to the legislation against such appeals in May, 418. It is worth while quoting the extraordinary explanation of this canon, given by Father Bottalla, S.J., a professor in S. Beuno's College, North Wales. He says (*Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 151), "The African Synod, in the above-mentioned canon, forbade nothing but the formal and judicial appeal of the inferior clergy to the see of Rome; it did not, and it could not, forbid their private recourse to the supreme pastor of the Church; and if, under any exceptional circumstances, the pope saw fit, he might suspend the effect of the general canon, and enable the condemned priest or deacon to lay a formal and judicial appeal before his court." Assuredly, if the Fathers of the African Church had accepted all this, they would never have ventured to meddle with a matter so completely beyond their control. In their letter to Celestine they expressly call on the pope to reject these private appeals to his see, which they describe as "improba refugia," a very proper title for such scandalous transactions.

had succeeded him. Celestine, without any communication with Africa, restored him to communion. It seems most extraordinary that pope after pope should have acted in this scandalous manner. Apparently, in order to assert the papal jurisdiction over Africa, the popes were willing to break the most fundamental canons of the Church,¹ and to run the risk of presenting the Roman Church to the eyes of the world as an accomplice in foul and enormous crimes.

Pope Celestine went on to add insult to injury. He wrote to the African Church, expressing his joy at finding Apiarius innocent, although he had never had any opportunity of hearing what the accusers of that wicked priest had to say; and then, to make things worse, he sent him back to Africa to be readmitted to communion, and with him he sent, as legate, that same Bishop Faustinus who had given such just cause of umbrage to the African Church on the previous occasion. When Faustinus arrived, a universal or plenary council of all Africa² was convoked, apparently in the year 426; and the bishops, under the presidency of S. Aurelius of Carthage, wrote an admirable letter (*Optaremus*) to Celestine. It was addressed "to the most beloved lord and honourable brother, Celestine." They begin by expressing the wish that, as Celestine had written to them about Apiarius with joy, so they could make their reply concerning him with similar joy. Then the gladness on both sides would be better founded, and the pope's satisfaction in regard to Apiarius would appear less hasty and precipitate. Then they proceed as follows, and I will give their exact words. They say, "When our holy brother and fellow-bishop Faustinus arrived, we assembled a council; and we believed that he had been sent with that man, in order that, as by his help Apiarius had formerly been restored to the priesthood, so now by his exertions the same Apiarius might be cleared of the very

¹ The first sentence of the fifth canon of Nicaea runs as follows: "Concerning those, whether of the clergy or of the laity, who have been excommunicated by the bishops in each several province, let the sentence hold good, according to the rule which prescribes that persons excommunicated by some bishops are not to be received into communion by others." The fifty-third canon of Elvira lays down that "a man who has been excommunicated for any crime can only be restored to communion by the bishop who excommunicated him. But if another bishop shall have presumed to receive him without the co-operation or consent of him by whom he was excommunicated, he will have to answer for it before his brethren, and will risk removal from his office." Duchesne (*Mélanges Renier*, pp. 159-174) assigns the Council of Elvira to the year 300. Compare also the sixteenth canon of Arles (A.D. 314), the sixth of Antioch (A.D. 341), and the thirteenth (*al.* sixteenth) of Sardica (A.D. 343); and see Dr. Bright's note on the fifth canon of Nicaea.

² The Ballerini, referring to a general council of the African Church, speak of it as a "concilium plenarium, seu, ut alio nomine promiscue vocabatur, universale" (cf. Ballerini, *Obs. in Dissert. xiii. Quesnell.*, § vi. n. xxviii., P. L., lvi. 1020).

great crimes charged against him by the people of Tabraca. But the course of examination in our council brought to light such great and monstrous crimes, as to overbear Faustinus, who acted rather as an advocate than as a judge, and who manifested rather the zeal of a lawyer engaged for the defence than the impartiality of an umpire. For first he vehemently opposed the whole assembly, inflicting on us many affronts under pretence of asserting the privileges of the Church of Rome, requiring that we should receive Apiarius back into communion, because your holiness, believing him to have appealed, though he was unable to prove that he had appealed, had restored him to communion. But to act in such a way was quite unlawful, as you will also better see by reading the acts of our synod. After a most laborious inquiry carried on for three days, during which, in the greatest affliction, we investigated the various charges against him, God the righteous Judge, strong and patient, put a complete end to the obstacles raised by our brother-bishop Faustinus and to the evasions of Apiarius himself, by which he was trying to conceal his execrably shameful acts. For his foul and disgusting obstinacy was overcome, by which he endeavoured to cover up, through an impudent denial, all this dirty mire; for our God put pressure upon his conscience, and published even to the eyes of men the secret things which He was already condemning in that man's heart, a very sty of wickedness; so that, notwithstanding his crafty denial, Apiarius suddenly burst forth into a confession of all the crimes with which he was charged, and of his own accord convicted himself of every kind of incredible infamy; and thus he changed to groans even the hope we had entertained, believing and desiring that he might be cleared from such shameful blots; except, indeed, that he mitigated by one consolation this our sorrow, in that he released us from the labour of a longer inquiry, and by confession had applied some sort of remedy to his own wounds, though, sir and brother (*domine frater*), it was done unwillingly and with a struggling conscience. Premising, therefore, our due regards to you,¹ we earnestly beg of you, that for the future you do not too easily admit to a hearing persons coming to Rome from Africa,² nor consent any more to receive to your communion those who have been excommunicated by us; because your reverence will readily

¹ "Praefato itaque debitae salutationis officio."

² There might, of course, be cases in which some doctrinal matter might be in dispute, in which it would be allowable to appeal from a decision of an African council to the Catholic episcopate beyond the seas, and pre-eminently to the occupants of the several apostolic thrones.

perceive that this has also been decreed by the Nicene Council.¹ For, although this seems to be there forbidden in respect of the inferior clergy or the laity, *how much more did the council will this to be observed in the case of bishops*, lest those who have been suspended from communion in their own province might seem to be restored to communion hastily or precipitately or in some undue sort by your holiness.² Let your holiness reject, as is worthy of you, that bad taking shelter with you of priests and of the clergy of lower degree, *both because by no ordinance of the Fathers has this right been withdrawn from the African Church, and also because the Nicene decrees have most plainly committed the inferior clergy and the bishops themselves to their metropolitans.*³ For they have ordained with great prudence and justice that *all matters shall be terminated in the places where they arise*; and they did not think that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be wanting to any province, by which grace the bishops of Christ would discern with prudence and maintain with constancy whatever was equitable; especially since any party, who thinks himself wronged by a judgement, may appeal to the synod of his province, or even to a general council [of all Africa]; *unless it be imagined by any one that our God can inspire a single individual with justice, and refuse it to an innumerable multitude of bishops assembled in council.*"

I must break off here to point out how faithfully the great African Church had guarded the tradition which she

¹ See the first note on p. 190. The Nicene Council makes no provision for any appeal to Rome. The provincial synod is the highest court of appeal which it recognizes.

² "Vel festinato vel praepropere vel indebite." The pope had no right to receive to his communion African Christians who had been excommunicated by the African Church, until they had been restored by their own church. If he did so, he would be acting hastily and precipitately and in an undue way. The great principle on which the council insists is "that all matters shall be terminated in the places where they arise." Dr. Rivington (*Dependence*, pp. 226, 227) has failed to realize this.

³ It will hardly be believed that Father Bottalla, speaking of this letter (*Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 142), says that the African Fathers "made no objection to appeals of bishops to the Roman pontiff, but only to those of the inferior clergy." He goes on to say (p. 143), "The African Church never denied the right of the pope to receive appeals in the case of bishops and even of priests. Such a denial was impossible, since that church had always looked upon the Roman Bishop, as not only its patriarch, but also the supreme pastor of the universal Church." Father Bottalla's argument may be retorted upon himself. As the African Church clearly did deny the right of the pope to receive appeals in the case of bishops and also of priests, it follows, on Father Bottalla's principles, that that church did not look upon the pope either as its patriarch or as "the supreme pastor of the universal Church." It is fair to add that all Roman Catholic divines are not like Father Bottalla. Tillemont (xiii. 862-866, and 1031-1039) and others candidly admit what ought never to have been denied. The Council of Carthage, under S. Aurelius, was carrying on the old principle laid down by S. Cyprian (see p. 53).

possessed nearly two hundred years before, in the time of S. Cyprian, who, you will remember, implied that no Christian would be likely to think that the authority of the bishops in Africa was inferior to the authority of the pope, except some few "desperate and abandoned men."¹

I now continue my quotation from the letter of the Council of Carthage to Pope Celestine. They go on to say, "How shall we be able to trust a sentence passed beyond the sea, since it will not be possible to send the necessary witnesses, whether on account of the weakness of sex, or of advanced age, or through any other impediment?"² For that any legates *a latere* should be sent by your holiness, we can find ordained by no synod of the Fathers." Next they point out that the Sardican canon, quoted by Faustinus, is not a genuine Nicene canon, as was made apparent by the authentic copies of the canons of Nicaea, which they had received from Alexandria and Constantinople. Finally, they conclude their letter thus. They say, "Moreover, refrain from sending any of your clerks, as executors of your orders,³ whoever they may be who petition you to send them, refrain from granting this, lest it should seem that we are introducing the smoky arrogance of the world into the Church of Christ, which sets before those who desire to see God the light of simplicity and the splendour of humility. For now that the miserable Apiarius has been removed out of the Church of Christ for his horrible crimes, we feel confident respecting our brother Faustinus, that, through the uprightness and moderation of your holiness, our brotherly charity remaining uninjured will by no means have to endure him any longer in Africa. Sir and brother, may our Lord long preserve your holiness to pray for us."⁴

¹ I have discussed the meaning of the passage quoted on p. 53, from which the expression, "desperate and abandoned men," is taken, in the Additional Note 18 (pp. 446-450).

² The whole of this reasoning is just as valid for the case of bishops as for the case of the inferior clergy. It goes to prove that "*all matters*" should "be terminated in the places where they arise." There is a passage in S. Augustine's forty-third (*al.* 162nd) letter, addressed to Glorius and others (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 91), which is sometimes quoted as if it implied that African bishops could appeal to Rome from the sentences of the regular ecclesiastical tribunals in Africa, but that priests and deacons could not so appeal. Such a view proceeds from a complete misunderstanding of the passage and of the circumstances connected with the origin of the Donatist schism, to which S. Augustine is referring. It would take too long to deal with the matter in a note. The reader may be referred to Archbishop De Marca (*De Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, lib. vii. cap. xvi. §§ vi.-ix., coll. 1053-1056, edit. Böhrer, 1708), and to Tillemont (vi. 15, 16).

³ On the subject of the *exsecutores* of the Roman bishops, see Du Cange (*Glossarium Med. et Infim. Latinitat.*, edit. 1843, tom. iii. p. 144) and Dom Constant (*P. L.*, l. 426, 427).

⁴ Coleti, iii. 532-534, and *P. L.*, l. 422-427. On the genuineness of this letter, see Appendix F, pp. 204-214.

Such was the celebrated letter¹ of the Church of North Africa to Pope Celestine. I cannot imagine a more complete repudiation of the papal idea. That idea involves the principle that *jure divino* every member of the Church, whether clerical or lay, has an inherent right to have "recourse to the pope's judgement in all causes which appertain to the jurisdiction of the Church." The African Fathers absolutely deny that right.² Because, if they had believed in it, they must have safeguarded it. No Christian man would pass over and ignore a matter of divine revelation. No assembly of Christian subjects could venture to dictate to their divinely appointed sovereign, that he should refrain from using one of his divinely given prerogatives. Ultramontane writers ask of us impossibilities when they ask us to believe that. Let them say, if they like, that the African Church was wrong, heretical in fact, in regard to that matter which, in the opinion of De Maistre, is the "necessary, only, and exclusive foundation of Christianity;" but, as honourable men, let them refrain from pretending that the Church of North Africa, in the time of S. Augustine, believed in the principles laid down by the Vatican Council. Such a pretence is an impertinence and an act of folly, which must alienate every person of good sense and Christian simplicity who is cognizant of it. Let the Church of S. Augustine, S. Aurelius, and S. Alypius be branded as heretical, if the Ultramontanes choose to have it so; we for our part are quite willing to stand side by side with those great saints, and to share their condemnation. There is the possibility, some may think the probability, that at the awful tribunal of our Lord hereafter the note of heresy may be otherwise assigned.

It is hardly worth while to refer to the absurd cavil which some Romanists³ make, when they set forth, as if it overthrew the whole argument arising out of the synodical letter which has been so largely quoted, the fact that Anthony, Bishop of Fussala, appealed in A.D. 421 (or 422) to Pope Boniface from the decision of a council in Numidia, which

¹ Bossuet (*Def. Decl. Cler. Gall.*, xi. 14, *Œuvres*, xxxiii. 334, edit. 1818) calls this letter "nobilem illam epistolam." The Ultramontane Lupus naturally calls it "infelicissimam, et scatenem erroribus," and the synod, which wrote it, he describes as "erraticam, deviam ac praevaricatoriam." The unfortunate Lupus, with his Ultramontane ideas, continually finds himself completely out of sympathy with the great saints of the fourth and fifth centuries. They and he lived in two different worlds of thought. Bossuet well describes his pettifogging criticisms on the African Fathers who wrote this letter, as "inepta, ne dicam impia" (*Op. cit.*, p. 337). For full proof that Bossuet was the author of the *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, the reader is referred to Cardinal de Bausset's *Histoire de Bossuet*, edit. 1819, tom. ii. pp. 381-429.

² For a fuller discussion of the views of the African bishops on the subject of appeals to Rome, see the Additional Note 68, p. 490.

³ E.g. Father Bottalla, *loc. cit.*

had passed sentence on him ; and that at a later stage, probably in 423, S. Augustine wrote to Pope Celestine (Boniface having died on the 4th of September, 422), imploring him not to reinstate Anthony in the see of Fussala, thereby acknowledging his right to do so.¹ Will it be believed that the whole of this transaction happened during that interval of seven years when the African Church, in pursuance of its temporary compact, allowed bishops to appeal to Rome? The argument deducible from S. Augustine's action in this matter falls entirely to the ground, and ought never to have been put forward.

But there is one point connected with this case of Anthony of Fussala which it may be well to notice. When Pope Boniface sent messengers into Africa with letters ordering that Anthony should be reinstated in his see, if he had made a true statement of his case to the pope, the people of Fussala were threatened with coercion by the secular arm, and they were told that soldiers would be sent to Fussala to force them to obey the sentence of the apostolic see. Here we see the effects of the laws of Valentinian and Gratian. The decisions of the pope in such a case, though they had no canonical force in Africa except under the temporary compact, had complete legal validity, and they could be enforced by the whole power of the Roman Empire. No wonder that in places where the bishops did not rise to the height of heroic sanctity which characterized S. Augustine and some of his African brethren, the local churches gave way to the

¹ Cf. S. Aug. *Ep.* ccix., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 777-780. It appears from this letter that Anthony argued that he ought either to have been deprived of the episcopate altogether, or to have been left in possession of his see of Fussala. His contention was that a bishop could not be punished with a minor penalty. In his reply to this argument, S. Augustine, writing to the pope, naturally looks about for precedents in proof of the position that minor penalties had been in past times inflicted on bishops in sentences which had been sanctioned by the see of Rome. He says, "There are cases on record, in which the apostolic see, either pronouncing judgement or ratifying the judgement of others, became responsible for decisions, according to which certain bishops, who had been found guilty of certain kinds of wrong-doing, were neither deprived of the honour of the episcopate, nor left altogether unpunished. I will not search out cases very remote from our times, but I will mention recent cases." Then he mentions three cases of bishops, who had been punished recently with minor penalties. All the three cases had arisen in the African province of Mauritania Caesariensis. As Tillemont (xiii. 1036) suggests, they may all have belonged to the period between 418 and 426, during which the African Church allowed appeals to Rome. In some of these cases Rome may have ratified the African sentence ; in others Rome may have softened a more stringent sentence, and may have appointed a minor penalty. As for the "cases very remote from our times," which S. Augustine declines to search out, they may have been cases which arose in the suburbicarian regions, in which the pope was metropolitan, or in Eastern Illyricum, where appeals to Rome were allowed. The explicit statements of the Council of Carthage cannot be overthrown by doubtful hypotheses concerning precedents of which we know nothing.

papal pretensions, and accepted law and justice from the pope's mouth. There is nothing more absolutely certain in the history of the Church than that the papal *jurisdiction*¹ outside the suburbicarian provinces mainly arose out of the legislation of the State. One may truly say that Erastianism begat it, and forgery developed it. I except, of course, the very restricted jurisdiction given at Sardica by canons which were at first only received in a relatively small portion of the Church, and which were never received in the greater part of the East as applicable to the East.

Let us now pass from Africa to Gaul, and inquire how the new papal claims were treated there. I might draw your attention to the case of Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, a man of saintly life, who was treated very unbecomingly by Pope Zosimus. That pope ventured to summon Proculus to Rome, but to this summons Proculus paid no attention; and Zosimus took steps to deprive him of his see, no doubt trusting to the aid of the civil power to secure that these uncanonical acts, which constituted an invasion of the jurisdiction of the provinces of Gaul, should practically take effect. But the death of Zosimus put an end to the whole affair.²

I prefer, however, to dwell on the case of S. Hilary of Arles, because his righteous resistance to the arbitrary interference of Pope S. Leo, though it constitutes an additional reason for honouring his holy memory, was nevertheless the occasion of the issuing of another imperial rescript, which enlarged the papal power, and did much to rivet its chains on the churches of the Western empire. S. Hilary was Metropolitan of Arles, a see which appears to have enjoyed, in the fifth century, a certain pre-eminence among the metropolitan sees of Gaul.³ He was a great friend of S. German of Auxerre, a saint to whom our own island is so greatly indebted, in that he was God's instrument for putting down Pelagianism in the British Church. In the year 444 S. Hilary was visiting S. German at Auxerre. While he was there, various illustrious persons and others came to him and to S. German, bringing complaints against Chelidonius, Bishop of Besançon. I am bound to say that the complaints would not strike us, in the nineteenth century, as anything very

¹ It may be well to call attention to the fact that I am dealing in the text with papal *jurisdiction*. The primacy of honour and influence enjoyed by the Roman Church, as an apostolic Church planted in the metropolis of the civilized world, can be traced back to sub-apostolic times.

² For Mgr. Duchesne's treatment of the case of Bishop Proculus, see note 2 on pp. 151, 152.

³ In the fifth century Arles had succeeded Trier as the centre of the imperial administration of the prefecture of the Gauls. In consequence of this civil primacy a certain measure of pre-eminence would inevitably accrue to the bishop.

serious. But S. Hilary and S. German would, of course, look at them according to the ideas of the fifth century, and according to the actual discipline of the Church at that epoch. It appears that Chelidonius had, as a layman, married a widow ; and the canons ordered that such a person should never be consecrated to the episcopate, even after his wife's death. A rule of that kind had been formulated at the Council of Valence, in the year 374,¹ and it appears also in the decretal epistle of Pope Siricius to Himerius of Tarragona.² Moreover, it was thoroughly accepted by S. Leo, and by the whole Western Church of that age. It was a sort of extension of S. Paul's rule, that a man who had been the husband of more than one wife was not a proper person to be ordained.³ Chelidonius had also, before his ordination, held some judicial office, in the fulfilment of which he had been obliged to condemn various people to death ; and according to the ecclesiastical law this fact disqualified him for the episcopate. There was no question that if the allegations were well-founded, then, according to the canons of the Church in that age, Chelidonius ought to be deposed. Accordingly, a council was summoned to meet at Besançon, at which both S. Hilary and S. German were present, and S. Hilary presided. Besançon was not in the province of Arles. Duchesne thinks that the region of Gaul, in which Besançon is situated, had not yet been organized under a metropolitan. If it be asked by what right S. Hilary did what he did in this matter in a place outside his province, the answer is obvious : "Hilaire avait sans doute agi en vertu du droit et même du devoir moral qui incombe à tout évêque de veiller autour de lui à ce que la discipline soit respectée." I quote the words of Duchesne.⁴ Anyhow, S. Hilary and the council determined that the facts were proved, and that Chelidonius ought to resign his office. This apparently he refused to do, and consequently the council proceeded to depose and excommunicate him, as a rebel against the authority of the Church.⁵ Thereupon Chelidonius went to Rome, and complained that he had been unjustly condemned. Tillemont says that Pope S. Leo, apparently without any investigation, admitted Chelidonius at once to communion. Herein, as Tillemont points out, S. Leo seems to have followed the example of his predecessors, Zosimus and Celestine, who, without proper inquiry, admitted the miserable Apiarius to communion when he took refuge with them. The Roman Church seems to have been so

¹ Coleti, ii. 1067.

² *Ibid.*, ii. 1217.

³ 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12.

⁴ *Fastes Épiscopaux de l'Ancienne Gaule*, i. 112, 113.

⁵ After Chelidonius' deposition Importunus was consecrated to fill the vacant see (see Tillemont, xv. 85).

possessed with the desire of domination, that it thought nothing of overthrowing the fundamental rules on which the discipline and unity of the Church rest.¹ When S. Hilary heard what had happened at Rome, he started off on foot in the middle of winter, and, crossing the Alps, he arrived, still on foot, in the eternal city. He visited first the tombs of the two great apostles and the relics of the martyrs, and then he went to pay his respects to the pope. He begged him, very deferentially, to see that the Church's rule was not broken by the admission of persons to communion in Rome, who had been formally excommunicated in Gaul. S. Hilary in no way proposed to accept S. Leo as judge in this matter.² The pope had no ground for claiming such a position. All that S. Hilary wished to do was to state clearly the facts of the case, and to beg the pope to maintain in Rome the discipline of the Church.³ S. Hilary had a great deal to put up with during his sojourn in the city. His biographer, S. Honoratus of Marseilles, tells us that he in no way feared those who threatened him; that he overcame those who disputed with him; that he did not yield to the powerful; that, even though he was in danger of his life, he would in no way admit to his communion a man whom he, in conjunction with such great men as S. German of Auxerre and the other Gallican bishops, had condemned.⁴ While he was in Rome he attended a

¹ I think that the words used in the text are a not unfair description of the general spirit of the Roman Church, from the time of Damasus onwards; but I am not prepared to say that, in his admission of Chelidonius to communion, when that excommunicated bishop arrived in Rome, S. Leo was actuated by any wrong motive. In all probability he was firmly persuaded that he had a right to receive an appeal from the decision of a Gallican synod, and to rehear the case in Rome; and he may also have supposed that the effect of the sentence of the court below was suspended until the appeal had been heard. Holding these ideas, he would seem to himself to be acting rightly when he admitted Chelidonius to communion, although, according to the earlier discipline of the Church, which had never been canonically altered, his action cannot be justified. The primitive discipline is admirably illustrated by an interesting episode in the history of the Roman Church. When the heretic, Marcion, who had been excommunicated by his father, the Bishop of Sinope in Pontus, arrived in Rome about the year 140, and begged to be admitted to communion, the rulers of the Roman Church declared that they were unable to act in the matter contrary to the decision of Marcion's venerated father (cf. S. Epiph. *Panar.*, haer. xlii.).

² Duchesne (*Fastes*, i. 113), speaking of S. Hilary, says, "Les explications qu'il donna au pape, dans un langage assez rude, n'allaient à rien moins qu'à décliner la compétence du Saint-siège en pareille matière." The Abbé Malnory (*Saint Césaire*, p. 42) agrees.

³ It seems evident that the canons of Sardica were not received as binding in Gaul in the time of S. Hilary. If the limited appeal to Rome, allowed by the Council of Sardica, had been accepted by the Gallican Church, S. Hilary could never have told S. Leo "se ad officia non ad causam venisse" (*Vit. Hilar. Arel.*, cap. xvii.). He would have had to allow that Chelidonius had a right to appeal, though he might have insisted that the appeal should be heard in Gaul, and not in Rome.

⁴ Cf. S. Honorat. *Vit. S. Hilarii Arelatensis*, in Quesnel's edition of S. Leo's works, edit. 1700, i. 369.

synod of bishops, at which Chelidonius also was present, and, apparently, he shocked the delicate Roman ears by the plainness of speech which he used in asserting the independence of the Church in Gaul.¹ He would not plead his cause before S. Leo, who, as S. Hilary rightly felt, had no jurisdiction in the matter. To the Roman mind this was insolence, and accordingly S. Hilary was actually put under arrest. As usual, the Church of Rome, in order to gain its point, fell back on the help of the civil power. However, when things had come to that pass, S. Hilary felt that it was time for him to return to Gaul. He therefore slipped away from his guards, and got back to Arles in the middle of February. S. Leo then acquitted Chelidonius, and issued an order that he should be re-established in his bishopric, on the ground that there was no proof that he had ever married a widow. Chelidonius was apparently re-established in his bishopric by the strong arm of the State. But S. Leo went further in the matter. He seems to have listened to all the tittle-tattle brought to his ears by those who felt aggrieved in any way by S. Hilary's saintly severity and apostolic spirit of discipline, and who were encouraged by what had happened to send their complaints to Rome. Tillemont and Fleury assert that S. Leo actually separated S. Hilary from his communion.²

¹ S. Leo (*Ep.* x. cap. iii., *P. L.*, liv. 630), speaking of S. Hilary's conduct at this synod, says that he uttered things "which it would be impossible for a layman to say or a bishop to listen to" (*quae nullus laicorum dicere, nullus sacerdotum posset audire*). In the preceding chapter of his letter, S. Leo had said that S. Hilary "would not suffer himself to be subject to the blessed Apostle Peter" (*ut se beato Apostolo Petro non patiaturs esse subiectum*).

² See Tillemont, xv. 80, 89, and Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. xxvii. § 5 (tom. vi. p. 269, edit. 1722). It is quite certain that S. Hilary did not communicate with S. Leo during the whole time that he was in Rome, for S. Leo (*Ep.* x. cap. vii.) says of him that "he thought it right to withdraw himself by a shameful flight (*turpi fuga*), *having no share in the apostolic communion, of which he did not deserve to partake*; God, as we believe, bringing this about, Who, in a way unexpected by us, both drew him to our judgement seat, and also brought to pass his secret departure in the midst of the investigation, *to prevent his sharing in our communion*." It seems to me that S. Leo implies that during the process of the investigation S. Hilary could not communicate with the Roman Church, but that he probably would have done so if he had remained to the end. It is to me uncertain whether S. Hilary's inability to communicate with S. Leo during the course of the investigation was the result of S. Leo's action, or of S. Hilary's own unwillingness. If the first view is correct, then S. Hilary must have been authoritatively suspended from communion, and so far Tillemont and Fleury would be justified. If the second view is correct, we have the spectacle of a great saint going to Rome and staying there for some time, but refusing to communicate with the pope. S. Hilary would hardly have acted in that way if he had held the Vatican doctrine of the papacy. Whichever way the question is decided, my argument remains unaffected. S. Hilary's disciple and biographer, S. Honoratus, tells us that while in Rome S. Hilary was threatened, was in peril of his life, and was put under arrest (*Vita S. Hilari. Arelat.*, cap. xvii.). The knowledge of these facts may mitigate our view of the "shamefulness" of his flight. Even Ultramontane historians have been compelled to acknowledge that S. Leo's conduct towards S. Hilary was, to say the least, unfortunate. Thus Cardinal Baronius, speaking

Whether he did so or not, the pope certainly professed to deprive Hilary of his metropolitan authority, and he made various other arrangements in regard to the churches of Gaul which could not be justified by the canons, and which, as Tillemont observes, were not carried out.¹

It seems to have been because S. Leo feared that the bishops of Gaul would not pay much attention to his revolutionary decrees, that he applied again to the civil power; that so, however much his orders might be lacking in canonical validity, they might, at any rate, be clothed with all the majesty of the imperial authority. The Emperor Valentinian III. was then ruling in the West. He was a feeble and contemptible prince, stained with every vice, who murdered with his own hands Aetius, the only great man in his service. It was to this Valentinian that S. Leo applied for help in his contest with S. Hilary. The Emperor, who was probably governed in the matter by his mother, the Empress Galla Placidia, did all that S. Leo wished, and addressed a rescript, in the year 445, to that same Patrician, Aetius, whom he afterwards killed. In this rescript the Emperor says, among other things, that "the peace of the churches will then only be preserved, when the whole body of them acknowledge their ruler. Hitherto this has been inviolably observed; but now Hilary of Arles, as we have learnt from the faithful report of the venerable man, Leo, the Roman pope, has, with contumacious daring, attempted certain unlawful things, and thus an abominable confusion has invaded the churches north of the Alps." Towards the end of the rescript the Emperor adds, "We decree, by a perpetual edict, that nothing shall be attempted contrary to ancient custom, either by the Gallican bishops or by the bishops of other provinces, without the authority of the venerable man, the pope of the eternal city; but whatever the authority of the apostolic see has sanctioned or shall sanction, let that be held by them and by all for a law; so that if any of the bishops shall neglect, when summoned, to come to the tribunal of the Roman prelate, let him be forced to come

of an angry letter written by S. Leo's successor, Pope Hilary, against another great light of the Church of Gaul, S. Mamertus of Vienne, says, "There is no cause for wonder that the Roman pontiff, Hilary, should have so vehemently attacked Mamertus, a man, as events proved, illustrious by his sanctity; for in these litigious cases it is very easy for any one to be deceived. Something very similar happened to S. Leo, who inveighed most bitterly against S. Hilary for very much the same reason. Who does not know that it often happens that the ears of pontiffs are filled with false accusations, by which they are deceived; and, when they imagine that they are acting in accordance with justice, they are really harassing the innocent" (Baron., *Annal. Eccl.*, s. a. 464).

¹ Tillemont, xv. 80, 81, 85, 86; compare the remarks of Baluze, in *De Marca's De Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, v. xxxiii., coll. 631-636, edit. Böhmer, 1708.

by the civil governor of the province.”¹ Thus did the decrepit autocracy of the dying empire plant in the home of freedom, the Church of God, the hateful likeness of itself. This rescript of Valentinian goes far beyond the rescript of Gratian. It makes the pope’s word law, and it makes the bishops his humble servants.² It is grievous to think that so noble a man as S. Leo really was, should have stained his history by his share in this degrading act of legislation. The Roman Catholic Tillemont justly observes that those who have any love for the liberty of the Church, and any knowledge of her discipline, will agree that this rescript will redound through all ages as little to the honour of Leo, whom it praises, as it does to the hurt of Hilary, whom it condemns.³ Succeeding popes knew well how to use such a law in their own interest.

In the meanwhile, the blessed Hilary⁴ spent the four remaining years of his saintly life working out his own salvation and promoting that of his people. He gave himself to prayer and preaching, and the practice of good works; he redoubled his austerities; he helped the poor of his diocese with gifts, and consoled them by his sympathy.⁵ At length he died, and, if Tillemont is right, he was at his death still out of communion with Rome. His body was carried to S. Stephen’s Church, the people crying out with one accord, “This day has for ever brought to an end the reproaches of an unjust accusation.”⁶ S. Honoratus, who was present, tells us that the saint’s remains were nearly torn to pieces by the crowds who pressed around to touch them.

Thus was gathered into the joys of Paradise one more of the long line of saints who have withstood the usurpations of the Roman pontiffs, and who, in many cases, have died outside their communion. One is thankful to know that after

¹ *Constitutio* Valentiniani III. Augusti, *inter Leoninas Ep.* xi., *P. L.*, liv. 638.

² The subsequent history shows what an effect it had in Gaul. The Gallican bishops were much more compliant with the papal claims, after the promulgation of Valentinian’s constitution, than they had been previously.

³ Tillemont, xv. 83, 84.

⁴ When S. Hilary got home to Arles, he showed the Christian meekness of his spirit by sending first the Priest Ravennius, and afterwards the Bishops Nectarius and Constantius, to pacify S. Leo’s wrath. However, he would not yield on the main point; and his friend Auxiliaris, the Prefect of Rome, who had acted as host to the Bishops Nectarius and Constantius, urged him to use “a certain softness” (*quâdam teneritudine*) in his messages, which would conciliate “the ears of the Romans” (*ures Romanorum*). Tillemont (xv. 85), after quoting this letter of Auxiliaris, observes that we are not told that S. Hilary followed the prefect’s advice, or that he made any further effort to appease S. Leo. Duchesne (*Fastes*, i. 117), speaking of S. Hilary, says, “Quand il mourut, le 5 Mai, 449, la réconciliation n’était pas faite.”

⁵ Tillemont, xv. 89.

⁶ “Haec dies querelas injustae imputationis perpetuo resecauit” (*Vit. S. Hilar. Arl.*, ap. *Opp.* S. Leon., edit. Quesnel, 1700, i. 371).

S. Hilary's death, S. Leo spoke of him¹ as a man "of holy memory;"² and his commemoration occurs on the 5th of May in the Roman Martyrology. It is well for the Church in all ages to meditate on the example of such saints, and to celebrate their names with honour from generation to generation.

It will not be possible for me in these lectures to trace the further development of the papal power, as it shows itself in the authentic records of the history of the Church. The rescript of the Emperor Valentinian III. formed a new starting-point, and all manner of causes combined together to help forward the evil growth. The barbarian invasions of the West, the Mohammedan conquest of the East and of Africa, the long succession of successful forgeries which formed a chain of which the forged decretals of the pseudo-Isidore constituted only one link, the final breach between the East and the West, the temporal sovereignty which the popes acquired, the Crusades, the close alliance between the State and the Church, the dependence of the later monastic orders and of the friars on the Roman see, the systematizing labours of the schoolmen and the canonists, working as they did so largely on spurious authorities,—all these causes, and many more, helped to develop the papal power from what it was in the time of S. Leo, into what it became in the time of Bellarmine and into what it is now, as set forth in the Vatican decrees. The thing itself is not of God. It is of the earth earthy. It is impossible to exaggerate its weakening effect on those portions of the Church which have accepted it. For a long while its worst excesses were rejected by the noblest provinces of the Roman communion, as, for example, by the illustrious Church of France. Now it seems as if its deadening influence had been bound upon the whole of that communion by the Vatican decrees of 1870. We ought to thank God every day that in His great mercy He has delivered the Church of England from that bondage. We must indeed mingle with our thanksgivings the deepest penitence and humiliation, when we think how unfaithful we have been in our use of our freedom; when we think of our lack of discipline, of our miserable Erastianism, of our worldliness,

¹ *Ep.* xl. *ad Episcopos per Arelatensem Galliae Provinciam constitutos*, P. L., liv. 815.

² These words of S. Leo would not of themselves prove that S. Hilary died in the Roman communion. In a letter to Bishop Paschasinus (*Ep.* lxxxviii. cap. iv., P. L., liv. 929), and also in a letter to the Emperor Marcian (*Ep.* cxxi. cap. ii., P. L., liv. 1056), S. Leo calls Theophilus of Alexandria a man "of holy memory." Now, Theophilus had been excommunicated by the Roman Church for what he had done against S. Chrysostom, and he died outside the Roman communion (see Tillemont, xi. 495).

of our Laodicene self-satisfaction, of our very imperfect grasp of certain aspects of primitive truth. We may, however, in all humility hope that in some degree we are improving. Thank God! it is no part of *our* creed that the Church, which we love, is as yet without spot or wrinkle.¹ *We* are free to see our faults, and to confess them, and to do what we can to amend them. The more we strive to amend what we see to be wrong, the more will our vision be purged, so that we shall become conscious of evil which we had not before suspected. Let us pray that we may be more and more weaned from trust in all mere earthly supports. It is not enough that we reject the earthliness of the *papacy*; we must seek to be freed from all *reliance* on the earthly accidents of our ecclesiastical position, on our connexion with the State, on our ancient endowments, on our social position. I do not say that we are necessarily to agitate for a revolution in these matters. The time may arrive when such an agitation may become necessary. But what we are bound to do is to wean our hearts from all *reliance* on these things, and to struggle continually against all that is corrupt and wrong, which may have crept into the Church in consequence of them. Our only real strength is in our true Head, Jesus Christ our Lord. If the Church had kept the eyes of her heart fixed on our Lord in the fourth century, as they had been fixed during the three previous centuries, that inroad of worldliness could never have taken place. It was the inroad of worldliness which in the West resulted in the papacy. We have got rid of the papacy, but we have not got rid of the worldliness. We need to live in much closer fellowship with our ascended King, not only in our individual life, though that, of course, must form the foundation, but also in our ecclesiastical life. We have to bring home to ourselves the living union which exists between Christ and the Church. No matter what clouds of danger and difficulty are lowering on the horizon, threatening the ship of the Church with an overwhelming storm, we have Christ with us in the ship, and He has pledged His word that He will bring us safely through. People often fly over to Rome, because they are so conscious of the terrible difficulties which threaten the Church on all sides, and they think somehow that a compact organization under an earthly head will give the Church the strength she needs. Alas! the earthly head, being no part of the institution of Christ, does not reveal the heavenly Head, but hides Him. It is the power of the heavenly Head, which we are to

¹ Cf. S. August., *De Perfect. Justit. Hom.*, cap. xv. § 35 (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1690, x. 183); see also S. Aug. *Retract.*, lib. i. cap. vii. § 5 (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1689, i. 10); and S. Thom. *Summ. Theol.*, iii. q. viii. a. iii. ad 2^m.

trust. It is His organic connexion with the Church that we are to realize. It is His guidance which is pledged to us. It is His Headship which will reveal itself most marvellously in the hour of greatest need, to those who are looking to Him. If we do not look to Him, we shall certainly be swept away, either into heresy, or into unbelief, or into the false unity of the papal communion. All those things are doomed to an awful ending. But through all the terrors of the last times Christ will purge and protect His own Church, and guard the faith of His people, who are trusting in Him and looking for the day of His glorious appearing.

APPENDIX F.

On the Genuineness of the Letter Optaremus, addressed by a Carthaginian Council (circa 426) to Pope Celestine (see p. 193).

DR. RIVINGTON undertakes the hopeless task of disputing the genuineness of the letter *Optaremus*,¹ addressed in 425 or 426 by a Council of Carthage to Pope Celestine. He says of it, that it "has every possible mark of forgery."²

His first objection to its genuineness is based on the fact that "it has no date."³ Well, the synodical letters, *Sanctum animum tuum* and *Fidei tuae*,⁴ addressed to Theodosius by two provincial councils of North Italy in 381 and 382, have no date. Similarly, the synodical letter *Quoniam Domino*,⁵ addressed in 419 by the seventeenth Council of Carthage under Aurelius to Pope Boniface, has no date. The synodical letter *Et hoc gloriæ vestrae*,⁶ addressed by a Synod of Rome under Damasus to the two Western Emperors, has no date. The synodical letter addressed by the Council of Nicaea to the Church of Alexandria⁷ has no date. The three synodical letters, addressed by the Council of Sardica (1) to the Catholic episcopate, (2) to Pope Julius, and (3) to the Church of Alexandria,⁸ respectively, have, neither of them, any date. But it would be wearisome to continue the list. The objection is absolutely futile.

Dr. Rivington's next proof of the spuriousness of the letter *Optaremus*, is, if possible, still more absurd. He says, "It comes before us as emanating from a universal synod of Africa—the peer of the great

¹ *P. L.*, i. 422.

² *Prim. Church*, p. 474.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

⁴ *Epp. inter Ambrosianas* xiii. et xiv., *P. L.*, xvi. 990, 994.

⁵ *P. L.*, xx. 752.

⁶ *P. L.*, xiii. 575.

⁷ Theodoret. *H. E.*, i. 8; Socrat. *H. E.*, i. 9; Coleti, ii. 260.

⁸ Coleti, ii. 699, 690, 694.

meeting of 419. Yet we have no record of this synod. This would not be fatal if we had the date, but there is no date."¹ As if there were not numbers of councils, of which the full acts have perished, or of which no mention is made by the historians or by other writers, but of whose canons or of whose synodical letters some remnants, often undated, remain and are received as authentic by all scholars. In this particular case we have good reason for thinking that, if not the complete acts, at least some of the canons of the council, which wrote the letter about appeals to Celestine, were still in existence in the sixth century, and that one of them was produced at the Council of Carthage, held under Boniface of Carthage at the close of the first quarter of that century. The acts of the council, held in 525, tell us that Boniface said, "Let the venerable ordinances of the ancient Fathers be brought forth out of the archives of this church, and let the things, which antiquity has bequeathed for observance to those who come after, be read out."² Then Agileius, the deacon, read out from the book of the canons a number of extracts, almost all of which had been taken from the acts of African councils. At length he read a canon of the sixteenth Council of Carthage under Aurelius (May, 418), prohibiting appeals; and then finally he passed on to the twentieth Council of Carthage under Aurelius, and read a canon of that synod, thus summarized: "Ut nullus ad transmarina audeat appellare."³ Now, the first great council at which the controversy about Apiarius was discussed, was the seventeenth council under Aurelius, held in 419. There followed an eighteenth council in 421, and a nineteenth council which, according to the Ballerini,⁴ was held between 421 and 425. Lastly, the twentieth council was held, according to the same learned critics, in 425 or 426.⁵ We learn from the canon of the twentieth council, quoted in 525, that that council certainly discussed the question of appeals to Rome, and prohibited them. Thus it appears that, about the time when the letter *Optaremus*, written to protest against appeals from Africa to Rome, must have been drawn up, if it is genuine, a council was held at Carthage, which by canon prohibited such appeals. The existence of the canon corroborates the genuineness of the letter. And we may well come to the conclusion that the letter emanated from the twentieth council under Aurelius. This is the view taken by the Ballerini,⁶ by Hefele,⁷ and by Maassen,⁸ all of them Roman-Catholic scholars of high renown.

Dr. Rivington bases a final argument on the episcopal names which

¹ *Prim. Church*, 304.

² Coleti, v. 778.

³ *Ibid.*, v. 780. The Ballerini express the opinion that another canon of this twentieth council, dealing with the frequency of provincial synods, has been preserved by Ferrandus, a Carthaginian deacon, who flourished during the first half of the sixth century.

⁴ *De Antiq. Collection. et Collector. Canonum*, pars ii. cap. iii. § 9, n. 58; *P. L.*, lvi. 121.

⁵ The Jesuit, Morcelli, in his *Africa Christiana* (ii. 24; iii. 113-116, edit. 1816), decides in favour of 426 as the true date of the council.

⁶ Ballerini, *De Antiq. Collect.*, pars ii. cap. iii. § 9, n. 59, *P. L.*, lvi. 121.

⁷ Hefele, ii. 480, E. tr.

⁸ Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, i. 183.

appear in the inscription of the letter *Optaremus*. The passage is too long to quote,¹ and the argument is too weak to need any detailed reply. The one point raised by Dr. Rivington which seems worth discussing, is the fact that the names of S. Alypius and S. Augustine are not to be found among the names in the inscription. It seems to me that the solution of the difficulty suggested by Dr. Rivington will be facilitated if we spend some little time in considering these names. In the copies of the letter which have come down to us, fifteen names are given, and the rest are summed up in the formula, "et caeteri." It is the common practice of the copyists to curtail long lists of names by putting down the first few, which head the list, and then adding the words, "et caeteri." Thus in the letter addressed by the Roman council of the year 371 to the Catholic bishops throughout the East, the copyists give ten names out of ninety-three, and sum up the eighty-three, whose names are not given, under the formula, "et caeteri."² On the other hand, in the Greek translation of that same letter only two names out of the ninety-three are given, all the others being summed up in the words, *καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ* (*et caeteri*).³ In a letter addressed to Pope Innocent, in the year 416, by a provincial council of Africa Proconsularis, held at Carthage, sixty-nine names are given, and the rest are represented by "et caeteri."⁴ In Pope Innocent's reply to a similar letter, addressed to him in that same year 416 by the Numidian provincial council of Mileum, only two names are given, followed by the usual formula, "et caeteri," which in this case stands for fifty-nine names of bishops.⁵ In the case of the letter *Quoniam Domino*, addressed from Carthage by the plenary council of all Africa to Pope Boniface in May, 419, only two names are given, followed by the words, "et caeteri qui praesentes adfuimus numero 217 ex omni concilio Africae;"⁶ so that in that case the expression "et caeteri" stands for 215 names.⁷ We now come to the case of the letter *Optaremus*, which was sent from Carthage to Pope Celestine in 425 or 426, by another plenary council of Africa. In the inscription of this letter fifteen names are given, after which follows the clause, "et caeteri qui in universali Africano concilio Carthaginis adfuimus."⁸ The councils of 419 and 426 were similar councils, and, so far as we have gone at present, one would be justified in saying that presumably they were of about the same size. Accordingly, until solid reasons are given to the contrary, we may fairly suppose that the "et caeteri" in the inscription of the letter *Optaremus* stands for at least 200 names.

The fifteen names actually given are no doubt the fifteen that stood first on the list, and they are the following: "Aurelius, Palatinus (or, according to another reading, 'Valentinus'),⁹ Antonius, Tutus, Servus Dei,

¹ It will be found in *Prim. Church*, p. 304.

² Theodoret, *H. E.*, ii. 17.

³ Compare *P. L.*, xx. 568, 569 with xx. 589.

⁴ *P. L.*, xx. 752.

⁵ The formula "et caeteri" stands for 214 names in the inscription of the letter *Optimam consuetudinem*, addressed by a plenary council of Africa to Pope John II. in the year 535 (*Collect. Avellan.*, edit. Günther, *Ep.* lxxxv., p. 328).

⁶ *P. L.*, l. 422, 423.

⁷ Coleti (iii. 532) and Mansi (iv. 515) read "Valentinus;" but Dom Coustant,

² *P. L.*, xiii. 347.

⁴ *P. L.*, xx. 564.

Terentius, Fortunatus, Martinus, Januarius, Optatus, Celticius (or Celticus), Donatus, Theasius, Vincentius, Fortunatianus." As Bishop of Carthage and Primate of all Africa, S. Aurelius, of course, heads the list. And if Valentinus, notwithstanding his old age, was really able to accomplish the journey to Carthage, then he would naturally occupy the second place as Primate of Numidia. But it is hardly likely that Valentinus was able to be present,¹ and, as we have seen, the second name is probably Palatinus.

Immediately after S. Aurelius one would expect to find, in the absence of the Numidian primate, the names of the representatives of the Proconsular province, that is to say, of the province immediately subject to the metropolitan jurisdiction of the see of Carthage.² And this is exactly what we do find, so far as we can identify the names. I will go through the list, taking first the names which can be identified—

(1) PALATINUS was Bishop of Bosa, or Bossa, in the Proconsular province.³ He was at the Collation of Carthage in 411,⁴ and signed the letter addressed by the Proconsular bishops to Pope Innocent in 416.⁵

(2) ANTONIUS must have held one of the 133 sees in the Proconsular on apparently better manuscript evidence, reads "Palatinus." This last is the reading both in the Freisingen Collection (Cod. Monac. lat. 6243, olim Cod. Fris. 43, fol. 85a) and in the Collection of Justel (Cod. Bodl. e Musaeo 100, olim Bodl. 3687, fol. 25b), as well as in others.

¹ In 426 S. Augustine was seventy-two years old; and Valentinus was probably consecrated to the episcopate several years before S. Augustine; for in the letter of the Council of Mileum to Pope Innocent in 416, the name of Valentinus comes second, that is to say, immediately after the name of Silvanus, who was at that time Primate of Numidia, whereas the name of S. Augustine comes eighth. It is true that we cannot be certain that in any particular list the episcopal names are arranged in the strict order of seniority, but S. Augustine was such a pre-eminently great person, that one would suppose that the tendency would be to give him a higher place on the list than would be strictly due to the length of time which he had spent in the episcopate. Moreover, four years earlier, in 412, we find that Valentinus ranked next to the primate Silvanus at the Council of Zerta. On the whole, it seems to me that in all probability Valentinus, who had been the senior bishop in Numidia since 419, and perhaps since 416, was too old in 426 to undertake the journey from his Numidian home to Carthage.

² Thus, in the plenary Council of Carthage of the year 390, the acts mention only three names, namely, first Genethlius of Carthage, and then Victor of Abdera and Victor of Pappianum, both of them bishops of the Carthaginian province (cf. *P. L.*, lxxxiv. 183, 184; and see Morcelli, i. 66, 252). Similarly, in the plenary council of 397 four names are given, namely, S. Aurelius of Carthage, the president, Victor of Pappianum, Tutus of Misgirpa, and Evangelus of Assuras, all of them bishops of the Proconsular province (see the thirty-third canon of the African code in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, *P. L.*, lxxvii. 193). Once more, in the second session of the plenary council of 419 there follow, immediately after the names of S. Aurelius of Carthage and of Faustinus the Roman legate, ten names of bishops belonging to the Proconsular province, who are described in the 127th canon of the African code as "legates of the Proconsular province." The three Numidian legates follow next, and then the legates of the other provinces (cf. *P. L.*, lxxvii. 222). It is true that in some African lists of episcopal names the Proconsular names are mentioned after the legates of some or all of the other provinces; but such an arrangement seems to be abnormal. The natural place for the names of the Proconsular legates is immediately after the names of the presidents.

³ Cf. Morcelli, i. 106.

⁴ Cf. *P. L.*, xi. 1290.

⁵ Cf. *Epp. inter Augustinianas* clxxv. et clxxxi., *P. L.*, xxxiii. 758, 780.

province, for he signed the Proconsular letter to Innocent.¹ His name is the sixth on the list of bishops who signed that letter. He does not appear among the bishops present at the Collation. His name may have dropped out of the record of that assembly, which is imperfect, or he may have been ill or otherwise prevented from attending,² or finally his elevation to the episcopate may not have taken place at the time when the Collation was held.³

(3) TUTUS was Bishop of the Ecclesia Melzitana. He belonged to the Proconsular province,⁴ was present at the Collation,⁵ and signed the Proconsular letter to Innocent. He cannot be identified with Tutus of Misgirpa, mentioned above. A bishop named Victor filled the see of Misgirpa in 411, and was present at the Collation.⁶

(4) SERVUS DEI was Bishop of Thubursicum Bure, in the Proconsular province.⁷ In the year 404 both he and his father, an aged priest, were brutally attacked by the Donatists, and his father died a few days afterwards in consequence of the blows which he had received.⁸ Servus Dei was present at the Collation.⁹

(5) MARTINUS seems to be an early copyist's mistake for MARIANUS or MARINUS.¹⁰ A bishop of that name occupied the see of Utzippara, in the Proconsular province,¹¹ as early as the year 411. He was at the Collation,¹² and signed the Proconsular letter to Innocent. He is men-

¹ It has been suggested by Morcelli (*Africa Christiana*, i. 121) that the Antonius who signed the Proconsular letter to Innocent in 416 was the Antonius of Carpis who was at the Collation of Carthage in the year 411 (cf. *Gesta Collat. Carthag.*, cognit. i. § 126, *P. L.*, xi. 1288). But this view cannot be maintained. The Bishop of Carpis in 419 was Pentadius, who acted in the great synod of that year as one of the ten legates of the Proconsular province (see the 127th canon of the African code, *P. L.*, lxvii. 222). If his predecessor was alive in the summer of 416, Pentadius cannot have counted much more than two years of episcopate at the time of the plenary council of 419. It is hardly conceivable that the Proconsular province, with more than a hundred bishops from whom to choose, should have elected as one of its legates so junior a bishop as, on Morcelli's hypothesis, Pentadius would have been. Pentadius was, I feel sure, consecrated to Carpis long before 416, and he ought, no doubt, to be identified with the Pentadius or Penthadius who signed the letter to Innocent, and who was also one of those to whom Innocent addressed his reply.

² The fact is that there were no less than 184 African sees unrepresented at the Collation. S. Alypius certified that 120 bishops "esse absentes, quos aut infirmitas, aut aetas, aut certe necessitas detinuit;" and Fortunatianus of Sicca added that 64 episcopal sees were vacant (cf. *Gesta Collat. Carthag.*, cognit. i. § 217, *P. L.*, xi. 1351).

³ I say nothing of Dr. Rivington's grotesque theory (see *Prim. Church*, p. 304), that the Antonius who signed the letter to Celestine is to be identified with the scandalous Numidian bishop, Anthony of Fussala. Dr. Rivington uses his theory to disprove the genuineness of the letter (see his *Appeal to History*, p. 39).

⁴ See Morcelli, i. 223, and Tissot's *Géographie comparée de la province Romaine d'Afrique*, ii. 774.

⁵ Cf. *P. L.*, xi. 1283.

⁶ Cf. *P. L.*, xi. 1292.

⁷ Cf. Morcelli, i. 318, 319; and Tissot, ii. 342.

⁸ Cf. S. Aug. *contra Cresconium*, iii. 43, *P. L.*, xliiii. 521, 522.

⁹ *P. L.*, xi. 1284.

¹⁰ The reading "Marinus" is found in various ancient manuscript copies of the letter *Optaremus*. Among them may be mentioned the Freisingen Collection (fol. 85a) and the Justel Collection (fol. 25b).

¹¹ Cf. Morcelli, i. 365.

¹² Cf. *P. L.*, xi. 1298.

tioned in the 127th canon of the African code as having been one of the legates for the Proconsular province at the plenary council of the year 419.¹ An interesting historical note, appended by some scribe to the letter *Quoniam Domino*, addressed to Pope Boniface by that council, mentions that the said letter was signed by Marinus or Marianus.²

(6) JANUARIUS was a bishop of the Proconsular province, for he signed the Proconsular letter to Innocent. It was probably this Januarius who was put on a commission along with nineteen other bishops by the plenary council of the year 401. The commission was directed to proceed to Hippo Diarrhytus, and to set in order the church in that city.³ He was probably Bishop of Gisipa, a city of the Proconsular province.⁴ Januarius of Gisipa took part in the Collation.⁵

(7) THEASIVS was Bishop of Memblosa, in the Proconsular province.⁶ In 401 he was put on the commission mentioned in the preceding paragraph. In 404 he was sent by the plenary council which met at Carthage in that year, as legate to the Emperor Honorius. We learn this fact from the ninety-second and ninety-third canons of the African code.⁷ Theasius is mentioned again in the hundredth canon of the same code.⁸ He signed the Proconsular letter to Innocent.

(8) VINCENTIUS was Bishop of the Ecclesia Culusitana, in the Proconsular province.⁹ He was sent by the plenary council of 407 as a legate to the Emperor Honorius.¹⁰ He was at the Collation, and was appointed to be one of the seven *actores* on the Catholic side along with S. Aurelius and S. Augustine and four others.¹¹ He signed in 416 the Proconsular letter to Innocent. In 418 he was sent as a legate by the Proconsular province to the Byzacene Council of Telepte.¹² He was one of the ten legates of the Proconsular province at the plenary council of 419.¹³

(9) FORTUNATIANUS was Bishop of Neapolis, in the Proconsular province.¹⁴ He signed the Proconsular letter to Innocent. He was also one of the ten legates of the Proconsular province in the plenary council of the year 419.¹⁵

¹ Cf. *P. L.*, lxxvii. 222.

² *Ibid.*, xx. 756. The authorities vary as to the spelling of the name.

³ See the seventy-eighth canon of the African code, *P. L.*, lxxvii. 206.

⁴ Cf. Morcelli, i. 174.

⁵ Cf. *P. L.*, xi. 1311.

⁶ See Morcelli, i. 224, and Tissot, ii. 774.

⁷ *P. L.*, lxxvii. 211.

⁸ *Ibid.*, lxxvii. 215.

⁹ Cf. Tissot, ii. 773.

¹⁰ See the ninety-seventh canon of the code, *P. L.*, lxxvii. 214.

¹¹ Cf. *P. L.*, xliiii. 827, et *Ibid.*, xi. 1227.

¹² *Ibid.*, lxxxiv. 235.

¹³ *Ibid.*, lxxvii. 222.

¹⁴ Cf. Tissot, ii. 133.

¹⁵ If we compare the list of bishops who signed the letter to Innocent in 416 with the list of those who signed the letter to Celestine in 426, we shall find that eight names appear on both lists; and it is right to call attention to the fact that the order in which these names occur in the one differs from the order in which they occur in the other. It seems to have been the custom in Africa to vary the order of episcopal names in such lists as those with which we are dealing. Thus,

These nine bishops, together with S. Aurelius, constitute two-thirds of the group of fifteen signatories, whose names stood first in the inscription of the letter *Optaremus*. I think that I have shown that there is good reason for thinking that every one of these nine bishops belonged to the Proconsular province, and that several of them had taken a prominent part in the affairs of the African Church. If we compare these signatories with the Proconsular legates in the plenary council of the year 419, it seems to me that it is the signatories who carry off the palm of distinction.¹

Besides the nine signatories, whose antecedents I have been investigating, there remain five others, about whom I have not much to say. Their names are Donatus, Fortunatus, Optatus, Terentius, and Celticius (or Celticus).² The first two of these names are among the commonest in Africa. The Bollandists mention thirty-two African saints of the name of Donatus; and there were thirty-one bishops of that name present at the Collation. As there were 133 sees or thereabouts in the Proconsular province, there were probably several bishops named Donatus in that province in the year 426; and I have no doubt that it was one of these whose name has been preserved in the inscription of the letter *Optaremus*. The same argument applies to the name Fortunatus, and in a less degree to the name Optatus. There are twenty-two African saints bearing the name of Fortunatus; and out of fourteen Optati, mentioned in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, eight are connected with Africa. That there were several bishops named Fortunatus, and also one or more named Optatus, in the Proconsular province in the year 426, is highly probable. Terentius was a not uncommon Latin name throughout the Roman Empire; and in Africa we find a martyr of that name,³ and also a Numidian bishop who was at the Collation, and who signed the Numidian letter to Innocent. Besides these, the poet Terence (Terentius Afer) should be mentioned, for he was a Carthaginian by birth. We may therefore well believe that there was a Terentius among the Proconsular bishops in 426. It only remains to consider the name Celticius (or Celticus). This is an uncommon name. But it so happens that S. Augustine, writing in 424, mentions that there was then living an African bishop of that name.⁴ S. Augustine narrates an event which happened to Celticius, when he was a youthful catechumen, and was residing or sojourning in Mauritania Sitifensis. I have no doubt that his episcopal see was situated in the Proconsular province. He may have been a native of that province, and have been merely sojourning in

if we compare the list of the Proconsular legates in the 127th canon of the code with the list in the inscription of the letter to Innocent, we shall find that in the former list Marianus precedes Adeodatus, whereas in the latter list Adeodatus precedes Marianus; and again we shall find that in the former list Pentadius precedes Rufinianus and Praetextatus, whereas in the latter list he comes after them. It follows, therefore, that the change of order in the names cannot be used as an argument against the genuineness of the letter to Celestine.

¹ It should be noted that the names of Vincentius Culusitanus and of Fortunatianus Neapolitanus appear in both lists.

² The Freisingen Collection and the Justel Collection read *Celticus*.

³ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. i. April., p. 860.

⁴ Cf. S. Aug., *De Octo Dulcitii Quaest.*, ad q. vii. § 3, *P. L.*, xl. 165, 166.

Mauritania, when the event recorded by S. Augustine occurred. Or, if he was born in Mauritania, he may have moved to Carthage or to some other city of the Carthaginian province in consequence of some circumstance, the record of which has not been preserved; or finally, S. Aurelius, who, as Bishop of Carthage, had the right of ordaining priests and of consecrating bishops taken from any part of Africa, may have summoned him from his native province in order to consecrate him bishop of some one or other of the Proconsular churches. He was no doubt the prelate who signed the letter to Pope Celestine.

The reason which to my mind makes it highly probable that these five bishops belonged to the Proconsular province, is the fact that in these African lists of episcopal names it is usual for the provincial legates to follow immediately after the presidents, and also for the legates to be grouped according to their provinces, with the legates of the Proconsular province normally at the head. These five bishops come in the middle of a group of Proconsular bishops, with names belonging to that province both preceding them and following them, and it is therefore only reasonable to suppose that they themselves occupied Proconsular sees.

The plenary council which wrote the final letter about appeals to Pope Celestine, and passed a trenchant canon forbidding altogether such appeals in the future, must have been a council of very special importance, and we may well suppose that the number of bishops attending it was unusually large. Moreover, as it met to consider in particular the case of Apiarius, a priest of the Proconsular province, that province had a special interest in the investigation. These considerations would account for there being at least thirteen Proconsular legates in 426, whereas there had been only ten in 419.

One cannot help regretting that the copyists did not take the trouble to give us a larger instalment of the names on the list. The Numidian legates would normally follow after the Proconsulars, and we should no doubt have found that S. Augustine and S. Alypius figured among them. Dr. Rivington argues that the letter is spurious, because the names of those two Numidian saints do not appear in the inscription.¹ My readers are now, I hope, in a position to recognize the inconclusiveness of such a plea.

Hitherto I have been rebutting objections. I proceed to indicate some portion of the evidence, in reliance on which the letter *Optaremus* has been treated as genuine by all the great scholars and critics, whether Western or Eastern, whether Anglican, Romanist, or Protestant.

There is hardly any ancient document of this sort, which has such an amount of varied attestation. It is contained in no less than eleven collections of canons and other ecclesiastical documents. It is in the Freisingen Collection; it is in the Dionysian Collection in all its various forms; it is in the S. Blaise Collection; in the Collection of the Vatican codex 1342; in the Chieti Collection; in the Justel Collection; in the Paris Collection; in the Collection of the Deacon Theodosius; in the Wurzburg

¹ See *Prim. Church*, p. 304.

Collection ; in the Diessen Collection ; and finally it is in the *Hispana*. There are at least 112 ancient *codices*, in which one or other of these various collections has been preserved, in all of which the letter *Optaremus* is to be found.

Fixing our attention on the first two collections that I have named, it is to be noted that the Freisingen Collection was almost certainly formed at Rome, that it seems to have been completed before the end of the fifth century, and was most probably in process of formation during the course of the latter half of that century. It is by no means improbable that the compiler or compilers had access to the archives of the Roman Church. In any case, the greater part of the materials of which he or they made use, must have been either directly copied from the authentic documents laid up in the archives, or at any rate ultimately derived from that source. The letters to and from the popes are arranged in the Freisingen Collection chronologically, as they would be if they were extracted from the pontifical registers ; and the letter *Optaremus* is found in its right place, at the head of the group of letters belonging to the episcopate of Pope Celestine.¹ As regards the Dionysian Collection, which seems to have been compiled either during the pontificate of Anastasius II. (496-498) or during that of Symmachus (498-514), it is certain that the compiler, Dionysius Exiguus, was living in high esteem at Rome, and that he enjoyed the friendship of all manner of highly placed personages. He dedicated one edition of his code to Pope Hormisdas, and mentions that he had undertaken this new edition at that pope's request. He was regarded in Rome as a great authority on the subject of canon law, and there is good reason to suppose that all facilities would be granted to him for consulting the registers and documents contained in the papal *scrinia* at the Lateran.² His collection contains one large section devoted to African documents ; and it is very noteworthy that all these documents must have found a place in the Roman archives. It is true that the collection includes acts and canons of various African councils, which do not appear to have been sent to Rome at the conclusion of those councils by the bishops who presided over them. But on investigation it turns out that all these acts and canons were read out at the

¹ The letter which follows the letter *Optaremus* in the Freisingen Collection, is the letter *Cuperemus* dated July 26, 428. Then follows the letter *Nulli sacerdotum* of the date July 21, 429 ; and so the series goes on in due order. I notice, however, that the letters *Spiritus Sancti* and *Sufficiat*, which are dated respectively May 8 and May 15, 431, appear in the Freisingen Collection in reverse order (cf. Maassen, *Quellen*, p. 485). They were, perhaps, copied into Celestine's register at the same time, and precedence may have been given to the letter *Sufficiat*, as being addressed to the Emperor.

² The learned Prior of Monte Cassino, Dom Ambrogio Amelli, whose hospitality and courtesy it is a great pleasure to me to recall, speaking of the years 530 to 535, says in his interesting work, *S. Leone Magno e l'Oriente* (p. 23), "There is, in fact, no one else, who during those five years had a free hand in the apostolic archives, besides Dionysius, and he had already during more than twenty years frequented the archives, collecting similar documents and translating them from Greek into Latin, in obedience to the injunctions of Pope Anastasius and of Hormisdas, and at the request of other illustrious personages, such as were the Cardinals Lawrence, Julian, and Peter, and again such as Felicianus Pastor and Archbishop Stephen."

great Carthaginian Council of 419,¹ and were copied into the acts of that council; and those acts were sent to Pope Boniface, as we learn from the synodical letter *Quoniam Domino*,² addressed to that pontiff; and the pope, when he had received the acts, would of course give orders that they should be preserved in the archives of his church, together with the covering letter addressed to him by the African bishops. The only documents to be found in the African section of the Dionysian code which were not entered in the acts of the council of 419, were (1) the letters and part of the enclosures sent to Carthage in that same year, 419, by S. Cyril of Alexandria and S. Atticus of Constantinople, and (2) the letter *Optaremus*, addressed to Pope Celestine by the twentieth Carthaginian Council under Aurelius.³ But a rubric which precedes the 135th canon of the Dionysian code, and another rubric prefixed to the 137th canon of the same code,⁴ inform us that the documents from Alexandria and Constantinople were dispatched to Rome from Carthage on November 26, 419. As to the letter *Optaremus*, inasmuch as it was addressed to the pope, it must, of course, if it was genuine, have been sent to the city of his residence. It appears therefore that Dionysius Exiguus had under his hand in the Roman archives the whole body of genuine African documents, which he has inserted in his code; and, being an accurate person, he may be presumed to have taken the trouble to assure himself of the genuineness of these documents by an inspection of the authentic copies preserved in the papal *scrinia*. Whether Dionysius actually undertook this work of verification or not, there can be no doubt, I think, that the collection of African documents, which he has inserted in his code, was formed at Rome, because that collection is limited to documents, copies of which must, on the hypothesis of their genuineness, have been sent to Rome. The collection had probably been made and published before Dionysius set to work to compile his code. That is, I think, implied in a sentence of his prefatory letter addressed to Bishop Stephen (*P. L.*, lxxvii. 142). The person who originally formed this African collection must in any case have derived his materials from the archives of the Roman Church. The Roman *provenance* of the collection makes it unlikely that an African forgery, whether Catholic or Donatist, should have been inserted; and assuredly the letter *Optaremus* is not the sort of document that is likely to have been forged in Rome.

That letter possesses a very high degree of importance, as illustrating the relations of the African Church to the Bishops of Rome at the end of the first quarter of the fifth century. Ultramontane writers feel the weight of its testimony against their own theories, which is all the more telling because the African Church was a Western and Latin-speaking

¹ See the thirty-third canon of the African code (*P. L.*, lxxvii. 193).

² Cf. *P. L.*, lxxvii. 225.

³ These supplementary documents are obviously added to the acts of the council of 419, because they are closely connected with those acts, and deal with the great question of appeals to Rome, which formed the principal subject of the discussions at the council (cf. Ballerín., *De Antiq. Collection. et Collector. Canonum*, pars ii. cap. iii. § 8, nn. 54 et 56, *P. L.*, lvi. 118, 120).

⁴ Cf. *P. L.*, lxxvii. 226, 227.

church ; and of late some of these writers have taken the line of denying the genuineness of the letter. I have thought it well, therefore, to set forth with some fulness answers to the principal objections which have been raised. A great deal more might be said in proof of the genuineness of the document, but I do not think that there is any need to prolong this appendix. The letter is, I believe, accepted as genuine by all the great Roman Catholic scholars.

PART II.

COMMUNION WITH THE ROMAN SEE IS NOT A NECESSARY CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

LECTURE VI.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

IN the preceding lectures I have spoken of the position of the Roman see during the first four and a half centuries of our era ; of its primacy of honour and influence, and of the causes which brought about that primacy ; of its metropolitan jurisdiction over the suburbicarian churches from the earliest times ; and of the patriarchal jurisdiction over the churches of the Western empire which it gradually acquired during the fourth and fifth centuries, partly through the legislation of the Council of Sardica, but mainly through the action of the civil power. We have noticed the upgrowth in Rome of the conception that S. Peter was bishop of the local Roman Church until his death, and that he bequeathed to his see his supposed primacy of jurisdiction, so that all subsequent popes were, in the sense implied by this theory, successors of S. Peter in S. Peter's own chair ; and attention has been called to the great use which was made of this conception, to give an appearance of apostolic and even of divine sanction to claims whose real origin was partly synodical, but mainly secular ; and we have observed how the use of these Petrine arguments during the process of the building up of the Western patriarchate prepared the way for the claim to an ecumenical jurisdiction over the whole Church, which was unmistakably put forth in the time of S. Leo. We have had occasion to notice over and over again how the great saints of the Church, especially in the East and in Africa and in Gaul, repudiated the papal jurisdiction, when from time to time an attempt was made to put it in force outside the suburbicarian limits ; and we have seen how entirely the supporters of the definitions of the Vatican

Council concerning the papal primacy fail, when they attempt to prove those definitions by an appeal to Holy Scripture.

I propose in these supplementary lectures to drop the discussion of the origin and growth of the papal jurisdiction, and to deal with the cognate subject of the claim of the Roman see to be the necessary centre of communion for the whole Church. The discussion of this claim will, I hope, throw light on the true nature of the Church's unity, a very important point, which is often much misunderstood.

In order that we may know precisely what the Roman claim is, I will quote a remarkable passage from a remarkable article by the late Cardinal Wiseman.¹ He says, "According to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic, and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the see of Rome, and who are not."² Thus, according to the teaching of this distinguished Roman Catholic prelate and divine, who was in every sense a representative man, communion with the Roman see is a test of fellowship with the Catholic Church; those who are out of communion with the Roman see are in schism; and this statement is put forth, not as the description of the *de facto* state of things in this or that age of the Church's history, but as "the doctrine of the ancient Fathers," which is presumably in accordance with the revealed will of God, and therefore obligatory for all time.

It is obvious that the theory, which underlies Dr. Wiseman's statement, is based on the notion that the Church's unity is always visibly manifested by the intercommunion of her various parts; that is to say, that the different dioceses, provinces, and patriarchates, into which the Church militant is divided, are at all times in visible communion with the see of Rome, their divinely appointed centre, and, as a consequence, in communion with each other. If at any time any patriarchate or province or diocese ceases to be in communion with the pope, on this theory it necessarily ceases for the time to be in fellowship with the Catholic Church; it has lapsed into schism. Such is the view which is held, I suppose, universally by modern Roman Catholics, which is implied in

¹ The article appeared in the *Dublin Review* for August, 1839. It is the famous article in which occurred a sentence quoted from S. Augustine, which produced the strange effect on Newman so graphically described in the *Apologia* (pp. 211-213, edit. 1864).

² *Dublin Review*, vol. vii. p. 163. The Jesuit Perrone (*Praelect. Theoll., Tractat. de Locc. Theoll.*, part. i. sect. ii. cap. ii. prop. iii. n. 576, edit. 1841, vol. ii. pars i. p. 408) inculcates the same teaching. Speaking of the Fathers, he says, "Opponebant haereticis et schismaticis auctoritatem ecclesiae romanae quæcum si quisvis haud communicaret, frustra speraret sese ad ecclesiam pertinere."

the second paragraph of the third chapter of the Vatican dogmatic decree, "*de Ecclesiâ Christi*," but to us seems so strange, and, in the face of the facts and writings of the saints, so absolutely untenable.

Not that we make light of the importance of visible unity. The fundamental law of the Church is the law of love; and to whatever degree the main body of the Church is dominated by that law, there will be a proportionate yearning for visible unity, and a readiness to give up a great deal in order to attain it. The several members of the Church, or a majority of them in the various provinces, being inwardly united by love, the provincial or national churches will manifest the love which dwells in the hearts of the faithful,¹ by external fellowship and intercommunion. Moreover, intercommunion is not merely an outcome and expression of love; it is in itself a sacred duty which cannot be set aside except in obedience to some higher law. But this visible unity, at which the Church is bound to aim, which expresses the supernatural love which dwells in her, is no mechanical unity resulting from an iron necessity; it is produced by the action of the Holy Ghost, who dwells in the Church and in the hearts of the Church's members, and by the free co-operation of their sanctified wills. On the Roman theory, the external unity of the Church is a mechanical unity; it is a unity which *cannot* be broken. Those who are in fellowship with the pope are in the Church, those who are not in fellowship are outside. On this theory, the visible unity of the Church, resulting from the intercommunion of her several parts, is not the outcome of the free co-operation of the members of the Church with the unifying influences of the Spirit of God; it is the rigidly necessary result of the way in which the Church is defined. It would be hardly conceivable that any one should on this theory pray that, in the sense indicated above, the Church may be visibly one;² the Church *must* be visibly one at all times, for the Church consists of the pope and those who are in visible communion with him. No amount of sin and unbelief can suspend or mar this Roman

¹ Obstacles resulting from past unfaithfulness may hinder at times this manifestation of love, but the spirit of unity and the tendency to unity are inseparable accompaniments of true love.

² It is true that in the Baptismal Service we pray that the child may be regenerated, although we are quite certain that it will be regenerated. But there is no analogy between such a prayer and a prayer for the visible unity of the Church offered by one who holds the Ultramontane theory of visible unity. Our certainty concerning the regeneration of the child depends upon our trust in God, and in His faithfulness to His promises; but on the Ultramontane theory the visible unity of the Church is the *necessary* consequence of the definition of the Church. It does not depend on the action of God, or on the promise of God. We can no more pray for it than we can pray that two and two may make four.

unity. The area of its fold may be diminished, but the external unity itself cannot be touched or affected. Very different is the primitive idea of visible unity, which is also our own. According to the primitive idea, visible unity is no mere logical deduction from a definition; it is the outcome of the unifying operation of the Holy Spirit, which may be thwarted, and which often has been thwarted. The faithful, and more especially the rulers of the Church, have to pray and labour continually that this unity may be maintained when it exists, and may be recovered when at any time it is lost. It is the good gift of our ascended Lord, for which we are dependent on Him.

No doubt there is an underlying essential unity which never ceases. All true parts of the Church are united by their profession of one faith in essentials, by their possession of the same spiritual powers transmitted from Christ and His apostles through the unbroken succession of the episcopate, by their adherence to the fundamental laws of the Church's polity and discipline, and above all by their organic union with their invisible Head and Centre, Christ our Lord. In this sense the Church is always one.¹ But that essential unity is, to a great extent, perceived by faith rather than by sight. The Church must never be content with the organic unity which never fails. It is her duty to do all she can to manifest to the world, by the visible intercommunion of her various parts, that she is indeed indwelt by the spirit of unity and love.

From what has been said, it will have been gathered that, according to the Roman idea, the Church is always visibly one by the external intercommunion of her several parts; but, according to the primitive teaching, this visible unity of the Church, though a great blessing which is always to be aimed at, is nevertheless not strictly necessary.² The essential unity of the Church remains, even though the outward social unity may from time to time be broken.

It will be well, before investigating the teaching of the

¹ On account of this abiding organic unity, we are always able to confess our faith in "the *one* holy Catholic and apostolic Church."

² It must always be remembered that there is a great difference between the visibility of the Church and the visibility of the unity of the Church, in so far as that visibility of unity arises from the intercommunion of the various local divisions of the Church. The Church militant is always a visible body; it is not always in the sense indicated above a visibly united body. The distinction is sometimes overlooked. It may be worth noticing that the distinction between the two ideas was clearly perceived by the divines and canonists who were appointed to prepare materials for the Vatican Council. In the "*Schema Constitutionis Dogmaticæ de Ecclesiâ Christi Patrum examini propositum*," the fourth chapter has for its title, "*Ecclesiam esse Societatem Visibilem*," and the fifth chapter has the title, "*De Visibili Ecclesiæ Unitate*" (see the *Collectio Lacensis*, tom. vii. coll. 568, 569).

Fathers, to whom Cardinal Wiseman rightly appeals, to consider whether Holy Scripture throws any light on the matter. I shall not attempt to exhaust the scriptural argument, but shall set before you two principal points, one connected with the Old Testament, and the other with a passage in our Lord's great prayer, which He offered just before His entrance on His Passion.

It seems to me that some considerable light comes to us, in regard to the matter which we are considering, from the history of God's ancient people, Israel. If we have any true perception of the relation between the old covenant and the new, we shall expect to find some close analogies between the organization and history of Israel and the organization and history of the Church; and so in fact we do. The Israelite nation was organized in twelve tribes under twelve tribal princes.¹ These princes were co-ordinate one with another. No one of them had jurisdiction over the rest. It may perhaps be allowed that Judah at the first start had a slight pre-eminence in honour. During the journey through the wilderness, they of the camp of Judah "set forth first."² But there was no central monarchy. The Lord God was the King of Israel, and the only King; and when He saw fit He raised up heroes sometimes from one tribe and sometimes from another,³ to act as His people's leaders in war, and as their supreme judges in peace. The organization seems to have been devised in such a way as to leave the people dependent on God for the preservation of their national unity. There was no permanent supreme controlling power here on earth. The people were not headless, but the Head was invisible. The constitution, to be workable, presupposed a lively faith. In later times the people's faith grew weak. They came to Samuel and said, "Make us a king to judge us like all the nations;"⁴ and so they "rejected" the Lord, that He "should not be King over them."⁵ As Samuel said to them some time afterwards, "Ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us: when the Lord your God was your king."⁶ So the Lord "gave them a king in His anger;"⁷ and first Saul, and then David, and then Solomon, reigned over them. It is most interesting to notice how, so long as the people were content with their twelve co-ordinate princes, and looked only to their invisible King to keep them one, their unity was preserved. But very soon after they had

¹ Numb. i. 4-16.

² *Ibid.*, ii. 9.
³ *E.g.* Joshua from Ephraim, Gideon from Manasseh, Jephthah from Gad, Samson from Dan.

⁴ I Sam. viii. 5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, viii. 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, xii. 12.

⁷ Hos. xiii. 11.

established an earthly monarchy, the germs of a schism began to manifest themselves. When, after the overthrow of Absalom, King David crossed back over the Jordan, "the men of Israel came to the king, and said unto the king, Why have our brethren the men of Judah stolen thee away?"¹ And they said to the men of Judah, "We have ten parts in the king, and we have also more right in David than ye. . . . And the words of the men of Judah were fiercer than the words of the men of Israel."² The whole passage shows clearly that the quarrel between the north and the south had begun.³ And at last the separation took place; and Rehoboam reigned in the south, and Jeroboam in the north. The visible unity of the people of God was suspended.⁴ But the people remained one. God's people were not limited to the two tribes who followed the house of David. When the prophet, who was Elisha's messenger, poured the oil on Jehu's head, he said unto him, "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, I have anointed thee king *over the people of the Lord, even over Israel.*"⁵ Israel had its great saints and prophets as well as Judah. One may almost say that in Elijah and Elisha Israel had greater saints than Judah; and the prophet expressly tells us that Samaria "did not commit half of Jerusalem's sins."⁶ Notwithstanding the suspension of political unity, the essential unity of the nation continued. S. Paul speaks of "the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise *our twelve tribes*, earnestly serving God night and day, hope to attain."⁷

I cannot doubt that this history of Israel was a prophecy of the Church of the new covenant. The Church, which is the new Israel, was organized by our Lord under twelve co-ordinate apostles. The apostles and their successors the bishops were the earthly guardians of the Church's unity; but in some sense the earthly organization was incomplete. There was no one central authority, no one permanent controlling power here on earth. The Church's Head was to be on high, within the veil. The constitution of the new Israel, as of the old, presupposed a living faith animating the militant Church and keeping it dependent on its Head. If the Church militant were a merely human creation, it would need, like other human societies, "a head in the same order of life as the rest of the body."⁸ But the Church is a divine

¹ 2 Sam. xix. 41.

² *Ibid.*, xix. 43.

³ Compare Blunt's *Undesigned Coincidences*, pp. 162-175 (8th edit.).

⁴ On S. Cyprian's interpretation of the type of the rending of Israel from Judah, see note 9 on pp. 469, 470.

⁵ 2 Kings ix. 6.

⁶ Ezek. xvi. 51.

⁷ Acts xxvi. 6, 7; cf. S. Jas. i. 1.

⁸ See Dr. Rivington's *Authority*, p. 5.

creation ; and though it has a human Head, that Head is the Incarnate Son of God enthroned in glory, organically united to the Church on earth, the permanent Source of her essential unity, and perfectly able to secure her visible social unity, whenever He sees that her faith, and love, and humility, and unworldliness make it safe and desirable to grant to her that boon. In the early ages of the Church the Lord Jesus did grant to His Church the complete gift of visible unity. The Church was persecuted and unworldly and full of faith and love, and the Lord took care that her essential unity should be manifested visibly by the intercommunion of her several parts. Afterwards the Church made terms with the world, and the world was admitted within the sacred enclosure, and some leading portions of the Church began to cry out, like Israel of old, "Nay ; but a king shall reign over us." Some were prepared to subject the Church to the Emperor, "the divine head,"¹ as he was called by the imperial commissioners at the Council of Chalcedon. Others were willing to subordinate the whole Church to the usurped jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs. But the mere fact that the notion of an earthly head² should be seriously entertained was a token of how grievously the Church had fallen from her primitive fulness of realization of the things unseen. As the West came more and more under the dominion of the papal head at Rome, it became increasingly evident that the Church would lose, at any rate for a time, her visible social unity. Our Lord would not allow His Church to remain visibly united by intercommunion of her parts under any head but Himself ; and so in process of time the East and West became separated, and later on Rome withdrew her communion from England. The analogy between Israel and the Church as regards this matter has been singularly complete.³

¹ Τῆ θείᾳ κορυφῇ (Coleti, iv. 1461).

² The Bishop of Rome may be called "head" in two senses. He may be called "head," as possessing from very ancient times a primacy of honour among bishops, just as the Duke of Norfolk may be called the head of the English nobility. He may also be called "head," as possessing a supposed primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church. It is in this latter sense that the word is used in the text.

³ It may be objected that, though there was no king at first in Israel, there was a high priest. But the high priest had, by the original constitution, no controlling power over the nation. The twelve tribal princes were not dependent on him. The Lord God was the only King. When the nation asked for a king, they did not reject the high priest : they rejected God. The high priest went on, as before, at the head of the ministers of worship. The appointment of a king was not the substitution of one visible governor for another : it was the substitution of a visible for an invisible head. Among the Israelites the government of the people was not entrusted to the priesthood ; but in the Church the bishops are not only priests, but princes, and it is as princes that they act as guardians of the Church's unity. If the Roman theory were true, the pope would be not only

And now to pass to a very important New Testament passage, which is often quoted as if it favoured the Roman theory that the Church is at all times a visibly united body. Our blessed Lord prayed on the night of His Passion, not only for His apostles, but, as He said, "for them also that believe on Me through their word ; that they may all be one ; even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be [one] in us : that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me" (S. John xvii. 20, 21).¹ This was undoubtedly a prayer which was intended to result in the unity of Christian believers, and the unity of which our Lord spoke was a *visible* unity. It was to be a unity which the world could perceive, and which would, when perceived, draw the world to faith in the divine mission of Christ. So far we shall all agree. But then the Roman argument goes on to assert, that what our Lord prayed for must necessarily be granted in all ages of the Church as a permanent gift. It is supposed that Christ's prayer for visible unity is equivalent to a divine promise that visible unity shall never fail. Surely that is a very doubtful hypothesis. The final object of the prayer was that the world should believe in the divine mission of Christ ; but the world as a whole has never yet believed in our Lord's divine mission. Doubtless the time will come when it will do so. The time will come when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea ;"² when "the kingdom of the world" shall "become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."³ I quite believe that that future conversion of the world will be brought about by a very wonderful restoration of visible unity to the Church, connected, it may be, with the future conversion of Israel ;⁴

the high priest, but also the monarch of the Church ; and it would be as monarch that he would claim to be the centre of unity and the possessor of supreme jurisdiction. If the history of Israel before the Babylonish captivity is to help us in the present discussion, we must fix our attention on its kings and princes, rather than on its priests and Levites. It need hardly be added that, when I speak of the bishops as princes, I am alluding, not to any coactive jurisdiction which may in this or that country be granted to them by the civil power, but to the inherent spiritual jurisdiction which they inherit from the apostles.

¹ The passage discussed in the text is admitted by Roman Catholics to be a passage of primary importance in connexion with the teaching of Holy Scripture about the unity of the Church. Mr. Allies, in the third section of his treatise on the *See of S. Peter* (edit. 1866, p. 113 f.), in which he deals with the unity of the Church as being "the end and office of the primacy" of the pope, starts with a discussion of S. John xvii. And Father Bottalla, in the first section of his book on "The supreme authority of the pope" (edit. 1868, pp. 8-10), begins his discussion of unity by a consideration of our Lord's words recorded in S. John xvii. 20-23. See also Palmieri's *Tractat. de Rom. Pont.*, edit. 1891, *Prolegom. de Eccl.*, § xlvi.iii., pp. 252, 253.

² Isa. xi. 9.

³ Rev. xi. 15.

⁴ The Jesuit, Father Knabenbauer, quotes and adopts a very apposite passage from Cornelius à Lapide, bearing on this matter. He says, "Bene notat *Lap.* :

for, as S. Paul says, "What shall the receiving of" Israel "be, but life from the dead?"¹ But the point to be noticed is that, though our Lord prayed with the intention that, as the result of His prayer, the world should believe in Him, that result has not yet been produced.² Our Lord's prayer, so far as it deals with the conversion of the world, is not equivalent to a promise applicable to all ages. And if the plain facts which history records, and which we see around us, compel us to this conclusion in regard to one object of the prayer, who shall venture to say that the same principle is not applicable to the other object? especially as the two objects of the prayer are so closely connected. Why may not the visible social unity of all believers be reserved for the future, as the conversion of the world is evidently reserved for the future?³ Moreover, it seems clear that the visible unity, which is to result in the conversion of the world, will be an unmistakable fact which the whole world will recognize. Its recognition will not depend on the world's accepting the private theory of one particular body of Christians. Roman

'tunc enim Antichristi regno everso Ecclesia ubique terrarum regnabit et fiet tam ex Judaeis quam ex Gentilibus unum ovile et unus pastor'" (Knabenb., *Comment. in Daniel* vii. 27, p. 202, edit. 1891).

¹ Rom. xi. 15.

² When our Lord says (S. John xvii. 20, 21), "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on Me through their word; that (*iva*) they may all be one; even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that (*iva*) they also may be [one] in us: that (*iva*) the world may believe that Thou didst send Me;" we are not to understand that our Lord is praying directly either for the visible unity of believers or for the conversion of the world. He prays for believers in general, as He had prayed for the apostles (vers. 11-15 and 17-19), that the Father would "keep them" and "sanctify them." That was the immediate intention of His prayer. But our Lord looks forward beyond the immediate intention. He wishes the faithful to be "kept" and "sanctified," in order that (*iva*) they may be one in the Father and in the Son, and in order that (*iva*) that unity visibly manifesting itself may result in the conversion of the world. The Church's visible unity and the world's conversion are the ultimate objects of His prayer. Compare the parallel prayer for the apostles in ver. 11, in which the immediate intention and the ultimate object are also distinguished.

³ Mr. Richardson (*What are the Catholic Claims?* p. 30) enumerates twelve claims, which he makes on behalf of the Roman communion. He formulates the fourth of these claims thus: "That not only did Christ pray to His Eternal Father for this visible unity, but that He also proclaimed the immediate answer to His prayer by the words, 'And the glory which Thou hast given Me I have given to them, that they may be one as We also are One,' etc. (John xvii. 22)." On p. 49 he appears to identify this gift of "glory" with "the outward expression of unity." All this is very strange and novel exegesis. The Fathers interpret the passage quite differently, and so does the great Jesuit commentator Maldonatus. S. Gregory Nyssen (*in illud, Tunc Ipse Filius subjiicitur*, P. G., xlv. 1320, 1321) understands the "glory" to be the gift of the Spirit. S. Augustine and S. Bede understand it of the future glory in the world to come. S. Chrysostom and his followers understand it of the gift of miracles. Maldonatus understands it of the love which our Lord felt for His followers. In any case the "glory," which our Lord had given, cannot be "the outward expression of unity." Our Lord implies that that is to be the ultimate result of the gift; it is not the gift itself.

Catholics may choose to imagine that they are the only people who really believe in Christ through the word of the apostles, and that, as they are visibly united, the first of the two objects, mentioned by our Lord in S. John xvii. 20, 21, has been attained in them. But it is evident that such a very partial realization of unity is no adequate fulfilment of our Lord's intention. What the world sees at present is a disunited Christendom ; what our Lord desired was a completely united Christendom ; and until that is attained, the promise implied in His great prayer remains unfulfilled. It is impossible to deduce from these words of Christ a pledge that the social unity of the Church shall *never* fail. The true deduction from what we are told about our Lord's prayer is just the opposite. If those for whom our Lord prayed constitute a body which *of necessity* is always visibly one by intercommunion, we should be obliged to say with all reverence that on that most sacred night our Lord had offered a needless prayer. We may gather, from the fact that He prayed, that the unity for which He prayed was a difficult thing, which could only be accomplished through the mighty power of the grace of God. Our Lord had in view a unity which would be brought about by the shedding forth of the Spirit of love, and by the Church's complete surrender of herself to the influences of that Spirit of love. He was not praying for a unity which should be the logically necessary outcome of a definition. Such a unity as our Lord prayed for is set before us in the history of the primitive Church, and such will be the visible unity of the finally reunited Church. For the present the Church and the world have made terms with each other ; love has grown cold, and disunion is the necessary result. It is for us to labour and pray, and thus prepare the way for those "times of refreshing,"¹ which we know, on the sure testimony of Holy Scripture, are to come at last.

But on this question of the nature of the Church's visible unity, and on the cognate question as to whether communion with the see of Rome is a necessary condition of membership in the Catholic Church, Cardinal Wiseman appeals to "the doctrine of the ancient Fathers." To the Fathers, therefore, let us go. We shall have to reconsider, from a different point of view, some incidents of Church history which have already been discussed in the lectures dealing with the jurisdiction of the papal^s see, but I hope that I shall be able to avoid monotonous repetition.

It will be remembered that Pope Victor (A.D. 188-198) "proscribed the Asian Christians by letters," and proclaimed

¹ Acts iii. 19.

that they "were all *utterly* separated from communion,"¹ because they kept Easter on the day of the Paschal full moon, on whatever day of the week that event might happen to fall. This, as far as I remember, was the first occasion when, on any large scale, the Church had an opportunity of showing by her action whether she really held the principle enunciated by Cardinal Wiseman, that communion with the see of Rome is the test which enables Catholics to be distinguished from schismatics. The Asian brethren were "entirely" (*ἄρδην*) cut off from the communion of the pope. The question arose, Were they entirely cut off from the unity of the Church? Eusebius tells us that "Victor *endeavoured* to cut off the churches of all Asia, together with the neighbouring churches, as heterodox, *from the common unity.*"² The pope *endeavoured*, but did not succeed. Separation from the communion of the pope did not decide the question of separation from the unity of the Catholic Church, even though the crime for which the Asians had been condemned was the most serious one of "heterodoxy." The pope decreed that they were heterodox, but the great majority of the bishops held them to be orthodox, and they maintained their communion with Polycrates of Ephesus and his colleagues, and somewhat sharply rebuked the pope for his obstinacy,³ until at last he or his successor gave way, and the peace of the Church was restored. Assuredly Cardinal Wiseman's theory is not borne out by the episode of the Paschal controversy.

In a previous lecture I have gone so fully into the history of the baptismal controversy in the time of S. Cyprian, that there is no need to traverse the ground again. I will only recall the fact that Pope Stephen cut off from his communion S. Cyprian and the whole North African Church,⁴ and also S. Firmilian and the churches of Cappadocia and of the neighbouring provinces; but those great saints maintained their ground, knowing well that they retained their membership in the Catholic Church, although deprived of the communion of the Roman see; and the whole Church, from their day to ours, has justified their view on this point, even though, in regard to some other aspects of the general controversy, the

¹ Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 24.

² Dom Coustant (*Romanorum Pontificum Epistl.*, tom. i. col. 100, edit. 1721) says, "Neque propterea secum pugnare credendus est Eusebius cum Victorem dicit conatum esse Asianos abscindere. Et abscidit enim re verâ Asianos, cum eos a communione suâ removit; et conatus est ab Ecclesie corpore segregare, cum ceteris Episcopis ad ideam præstandum et literis et exemplo auctor fuit. At plerique eum potius commonendum censuerunt, ut in proposito non permaneret." Compare Additional Note 6, pp. 436, 437.

³ Pope Nicholas I. confessed that "Videamus Victorem papam . . . paene a totius Ecclesie præsulibus pertinaciae redargutum" (Coleti, ix. 1360).

⁴ See Appendix A, pp. 72-77.

Africans and Asians would find few supporters at the present time, at any rate in the West. I hardly suppose that any one will be ready to come forward in defence of the notion that S. Cyprian and S. Firmilian and the churches of the East and of the South were all in schism after Stephen had cut them off from his communion ; but undoubtedly they must be pronounced to be schismatics, if Cardinal Wiseman's principle is a trustworthy test.

LECTURE VII.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE
CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—I.

The thirty years of promiscuous communion in the East.—
A.D. 331 TO A.D. 361.

IN illustration of the general thesis which I have undertaken to prove and illustrate in this second part of my book—the thesis, I mean, that communion with the Roman see is not a necessary condition of membership in the Catholic Church—I pass now to the consideration of the relation of the Church of Antioch and of other Eastern churches to the Church of Rome during the larger part of the fourth century; and I shall draw special attention to the case of S. Meletius of Antioch and to that of S. Flavian, his successor. The whole history seems to me to throw light on the way in which Cardinal Wiseman's principle would have been viewed by great saints of the early Church.

We have seen that, after the deposition of S. Eustathius of Antioch, some time during the winter of 330–31,¹ the Church of Antioch was governed during thirty years by a succession of bishops who were, all of them, Arians, some secretly and others openly.² Their names were Euphronius,³ who sat from 331 to 333; Flacillus, who sat from 333 to 342; Stephen, who sat from 342 to 344; Leontius, who sat from 344 to 357; and Eudoxius, who sat from 357 to 359. After the deposition of Eudoxius by the Council of Seleucia, in October, 359, the see was vacant for more than a year,⁴ until

¹ See p. 158.

² On the open Arianism of some of these bishops, see note 2 on p. 158.

³ I follow Bishop Lightfoot (Smith and Wace, *D. C. B.*, ii. 315, note *e*) in making Euphronius the immediate successor of S. Eustathius, thus getting rid of Eulalius mentioned by S. Jerome and Theodoret, and of Paulinus of Tyre, mentioned by Philostorgius.

⁴ I take no account of Anianus, who was appointed as successor to Eudoxius by the Council of Seleucia. He does not seem to have ever actually occupied the see.

the election of Meletius in the beginning of 361. The great majority of the Catholics of Antioch, following the advice of their unjustly deposed bishop, S. Eustathius, remained in communion with the heretical bishops who succeeded him;¹ but a small body of zealous Catholics refused to hold any fellowship with bishops who were unsound on such a central article of the faith as the dogma of our Lord's Divinity, and held their assemblies apart, under the leadership of their priest, Paulinus. These dissidents were commonly called Eustathians. It must be thoroughly understood that the breach between the Eustathians and the Church of Antioch was complete.² From the Eustathian point of view, the Church of Antioch was committed to deadly heresy by its acceptance of a succession of Arian bishops, and by the admission of other Arians to communion, which resulted from such acceptance.

I think that, considering the central character of the dogma which was in dispute, the Eustathians cannot be regarded as having fallen into a state of schism in consequence of their act of separation in 331. But still less can it be maintained that the great body of Antiochene Catholics lost their catholicity because, in accordance with S. Eustathius' counsel, they accepted, as their chief pastors, bishops who were in fact heretical. These successors of S. Eustathius remained in communion with the Catholic episcopate of both East and West for several years, and afterwards, when they lost the communion of the West, they still retained that of the East. It appears, therefore, that, as the result of the events of 331, the Church of Antioch was divided by a schism, but that neither party in the dispute was *in schism*. It happened then, as so often before and since, that the external social unity of the Church was in abeyance, while the fundamental unity remained.

However, even though it be admitted that the Eustathians, after their secession in 331, were not schismatics, it must be confessed that they were in an unfortunate position. They were a very small body,³ and they were apparently out of

¹ Cf. S. Chrys. *Hom. in S. Eustathium*, § 4, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 609.

² Tillemont (vii. 28), after speaking of the Arianizing successors of S. Eustathius, says that the followers of Paulinus "se crurent obligés de se séparer de leur communion;" and Professor Gwatkin (*Studies of Arianism*, p. 74) says that S. Eustathius' "departure was followed by an open schism, when the Nicene party refused to communicate with Euphronius." It should be observed that, although the Eustathians may be called "the Nicene party," as using the full terminology of the Nicene definitions, yet it must not be supposed that the great mass of the Antiochene Catholics were other than Nicene in their faith. They held the faith, although, in common with most Eastern Catholics, they in all probability refrained from using some of the Nicene expressions. They certainly did not regard the acceptance of those expressions as of vital importance.

³ Duchesne (*Églises Séparées*, p. 180), contrasting the Church of Antioch

communion with the bishops of the whole world. Euphronius, the first successor of S. Eustathius, from whose communion the Eustathians had withdrawn, enjoyed the communion of the Churches of Rome and of Alexandria, and generally of the West and of Egypt and of the East. Flacillus, the successor of Euphronius, took part in the Council of Tyre, which deposed and excommunicated S. Athanasius for supposed sacrilege. It would follow that from the date of that council, namely, 335, the Church of Antioch ceased to be in communion with the Church of Alexandria. But it still retained the communion of the great majority of the bishops both in East and West.

So far as the East is concerned, one may refer to the synods held at Antioch in 339, 340, and 341, and especially to the great Council of the Dedication¹ held at midsummer in the last of these years. S. Hilary of Poitiers describes that council as a "sanctorum synodus."² The larger number of the Fathers present at it seem to have belonged to the conservative middle party, to which were attached the majority of the Eastern bishops; but there were some Eusebian intriguers, who, however, were also in Catholic communion. Flacillus of Antioch "probably presided."³

That the Church of Antioch during the episcopate of Flacillus enjoyed the communion of the West is shown by its intercourse with S. Julius of Rome. Bishop Hefele says, "Even Pope Julius himself, although he strongly blames the Eusebians for their deposition of S. Athanasius, in no wise treats their assembly as an Arian cabal, but repeatedly calls them his 'dear brethren.' And did he not also invite them to a common synod to inquire into the charges made against Athanasius?"⁴ Similarly, Stephen, the successor of Flacillus, and other Eastern bishops, who were in fact heretics, were summoned to the Council of Sardica in 343, as bishops of the Catholic Church.

This combination of Catholics and Arians in one communion continued both in the East and West until the time of the above-mentioned Council of Sardica. But the state of things was changed by what took place at that council. It will be remembered that most of the Eastern bishops, who

with the Eustathian community, speaks of the one as "la grande église," and of the other as "une petite coterie." Similarly, Dom Maran, in his Preface to the third volume of the Benedictine edition of S. Basil's Works (§ ii., p. xi.), contrasts the "magna Meletii ecclesia" with the "pusillus Paulini conventus."

¹ The council was so called, because it was assembled on the occasion of the dedication of the "Golden Church" at Antioch.

² S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, cap. xxxii., *P. L.*, x. 504.

³ Hefele, ii. 58, E. tr.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ii. 66.

had obeyed the imperial summons to come to Sardica, withdrew in a body from the council; and after their departure they went on to organize themselves as an opposition council at Philippopolis. At Sardica, after the withdrawal of the Easterns, there were left about ninety-six Western bishops and six Easterns. At Philippopolis there were about eighty Easterns. The Western council proceeded to depose from the episcopate and excommunicate the Arian ringleaders, namely, Stephen of Antioch, Acacius of Caesarea, and six others.¹ On the other hand, the Eastern council at Philippopolis anathematized Marcellus, who really was a heretic,² and along with him S. Athanasius and other Catholic Easterns; and further, it excommunicated S. Julius of Rome, Hosius of Cordova, S. Maximin of Trier, and other Westerns;³ and it went so far as to include in its condemnation all those who should communicate with the leaders who had been cut off by name.⁴

The Council of Philippopolis may roughly be said to have represented the provinces belonging to what were afterwards known as the patriarchates of Constantinople and Antioch.⁵ This large section of the Church withdrew its communion from the West, as it had already, for the most part, withdrawn it from Egypt. It is important to notice that the Eastern bishops did not accuse S. Julius and the Westerns of heresy;⁶ but they anathematized them for admitting to their communion S. Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and others, who on various grounds had been condemned in Eastern councils. Thus it came to pass that the external unity of the Church was broken on a large scale in the year 343. From that time onwards Arians were excluded from communion in the West and in Egypt; but the combination of Catholics and Arians in one communion continued as before

¹ The council also excommunicated Basil of Ancyra and two others, who were considered to have invaded sees which were already occupied.

² See p. 231, note 2.

³ Cf. S. Hilar. *Fragm.* iii. 27, 28, *P. L.*, x. 674, 675.

⁴ Cf. *op. cit.* iii. 24, *P. L.*, x. 672.

⁵ There was, however, at least one Western bishop at Philippopolis, namely, the shifty Arian, Valens of Mursa (cf. S. Hilar. *Fragm.* iii. 29, *P. L.*, x. 678). He signed the encyclical of the synod last, as being in some sense a stranger.

⁶ The majority of the Eastern bishops at Philippopolis were by no means Arian in doctrine; they held substantially the Nicene faith, though, like S. Cyril of Jerusalem, they probably, through fear of Sabellianism and through antagonism to the really heretical views of Marcellus of Ancyra, scrupled at the word *ὁμοούσιος*. The Council of Sardica carefully avoided bringing any charge of heresy against the Eastern Church as a whole. But there can be no doubt that some of the Eastern leaders, as, for example, Stephen of Antioch, and others of the rank and file, were real Arians. Yet the creed put out at Philippopolis expressly condemns some of the Arian positions. It was one of the creeds contained in the composite formula which was signed by Pope Liberius at Sirmium, in 358.

in the larger part of the East, and that combination did not begin to be dissolved until 361.¹

The Council of Sardica had been convoked with the intention of its being an ecumenical council, but, owing to the secession of the Easterns, that intention failed. If it had really been ecumenical, its sentence of deposition and excommunication passed upon Stephen of Antioch, Acacius of Caesarea, and the six other Arian ringleaders would have taken effect ; but, as it was in fact merely a Western council, while it could withdraw the communion of the West from those Easterns whom it condemned, it had no authority to depose them from their sees or to separate them from the communion of the Catholic Church. Similarly, the anathemas of the Council of Philippopolis resulted in the withdrawal of the communion of the greater part of the Eastern Church from S. Julius and his allies, but they could not affect the good standing of the Westerns in the Church of Christ. The holding of the two councils resulted in a disruption of communion between the East and the West, but they made no change in the ecclesiastical *status* of the individual bishops, who were condemned *nominatim* by either the one synod or the other. Assuredly Stephen, Acacius, and the other Arian leaders richly deserved to be deposed and excommunicated,² but they escaped on that occasion, in consequence of the incompetence of the court which dealt with their case. No doubt, if the decisions of the Council of Sardica had been accepted afterwards by the East, they might have become effective as

¹ Socrates (ii. 22), speaking of the result of the two councils of Sardica and Philippopolis, says, "The West was therefore separated from the East ; and the boundary of communion was the mountain called Tisoukis [that is to say, the pass of Succi, the principal pass of Mount Haemus], which divides the Illyrians from the Thracians. As far as this mountain there was indiscriminate communion, although there was a difference of faith ; but beyond it [*i.e.* in the West] the two parties [Catholic and Arian] did not communicate with one another." It should be noted that Mount Haemus formed the boundary between the Western Empire under Constant and the Eastern Empire under Constantius. The pass of Succi lay between Sardica and Philippopolis. Sozomen (iii. 13) says, "After this synod [of Sardica] they ceased to hold intercourse with each other in the manner usual with those who agree in their belief, nor did they communicate together ; the Westerns as far as Thrace separating themselves, and the Easterns as far as Illyricum."

² Similarly, Marcellus of Ancyra, on the other side, deserved the most severe censures of the Church. As he was an Eastern, it may be held that the anathema fulminated against him at Philippopolis was valid. Duchesne (*Églises Séparées*, p. 180) says of him that his "doctrine ne différait que par des nuances de l'ancien sabellianisme." Duchesne also suggests that Marcellus must have exhibited to the Council of Sardica a very expurgated edition of his treatise, *De Subjectione Domini Christi*, for otherwise the council's acquittal of him would be inexplicable (see the passage quoted from Duchesne in Mgr. Batiffol's *La Littérature Grecque*, pp. 272, 273 [*Anciennes Littératures Chrétiennes*]). For further details about the heresy of Marcellus, see pp. 480, 481. Dr. Gwatkin (*Studies of Arianism*, p. 81), speaking of Marcellus, says, "As far as doctrine went, there was not much to choose between him and Arius." See also p. 291, note 1, and p. 351, note 2.

representing the morally unanimous judgement of the whole Church ; but, though great efforts were made to get the Sardican encyclical signed by the universal episcopate, these efforts failed in those provinces which in later times composed the patriarchates of Constantinople and Antioch.¹ Stephen, therefore, for the present remained the legitimate Bishop of Antioch. However, in a few months' time he was canonically deposed by the bishops of his province and patriarchate (if by anticipation I may use that term), in consequence of the "diabolical" plot by which he had endeavoured to blast the character of Euphrates of Cologne, one of two episcopal envoys sent by the Council of Sardica to the Eastern Emperor, Constantius. The synod, which deposed Stephen, substituted Leontius in his place.

Thus through the action of the two councils of Sardica and Philippopolis the great Church of Antioch became separated from the communion of Rome ; and it remained in that state of separation for the space of fifty-five years, that is to say, from 343 to 398.² The small body of the Eustathians, which had seceded in 331 from the communion of the Antiochene bishops, and so from the communion of the rest of Christendom including Rome, remained out of fellowship with the pope until 375, that is to say, for forty-four years. If I have stated the facts accurately, the conclusion follows that between the years 343 and 375 neither of the two rival communions at Antioch was recognized by the Roman Church.

It is true that twice during the reign of Constantius efforts were made by the Church of Antioch and by other Eastern churches to heal the breach ; but the Westerns very properly insisted that as a preliminary the Easterns should condemn Arianism in an unequivocal manner, and that the Easterns would not do. The first of these attempts took place immediately after the consecration of Leontius to the throne of Antioch in 344. He and the council which elected

¹ One must except the province of Palestine, which at that time was in some degree subject to the see of Antioch, though afterwards it became a separate patriarchate. In 346 sixteen of the Palestinian bishops, that is to say, all of them except some two or three (cf. S. Athan. *Hist. Arian.*, § 25), signed the decrees of Sardica, and communicated with S. Athanasius, and probably maintained cordial relations with him until the accession of S. Cyril to the see of Jerusalem in 350.

² It may, perhaps, be suggested that intercommunion between Rome and Antioch may have existed after the fall of Pope Liberius in 357, during the time when the Roman Church was out of communion with S. Athanasius, and communicated with some of the Orientals. But Eudoxius was Bishop of Antioch from 357 to 359, and we have no reason to think that Liberius ever sank so low as to communicate with that blasphemer. After 359 there are no traces of any communication between Liberius and the East until after the Council of Alexandria in 362. Even then there was no renewal of communion with Antioch.

him sent to the West a deputation of four bishops,¹ one of whom was the notorious Eudoxius, who afterwards succeeded Leontius in his see. These Eastern legates appeared at the Council of Milan, which was held in 345, and they succeeded in inducing that council to condemn Photinus of Sirmium, the disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra. But as the Eastern envoys refused to anathematize the heretical opinions of Arius, the effort to reunite the East and West in one communion failed, the legates retiring in anger.

No further attempt to heal the breach was made by the Easterns during the lifetime of S. Julius, whom they had excommunicated at Philippopolis; but in 352 that pope died and was succeeded by Liberius. When the news of his accession reached the East, a synod appears to have been convoked, and letters were written to the new pope, inviting him to enter into cordial relations with the Eastern church. But this Liberius refused to do. In writing about his refusal to the Emperor Constantius two years later, the pope explained that it was impossible for him to communicate with the Easterns, since more than eight years before their four legates had refused to condemn at Milan the heretical opinion of Arius.² It will be noticed that, whereas the Council of Sardica in 343 had excommunicated only certain ringleaders of the Arians, Liberius in 354 regarded the whole of the Eastern Church as being external to his communion. There must have been some authoritative act, subsequent to the close of the Council of Sardica, which broke all the remaining bonds of union between the East and the West. The anathemas of the Council of Philippopolis constituted such an act on the Eastern side; but there seems to have been also some general anathema pronounced against the East by the Roman Church. A record of this excommunication of the East is to be found, I think, in the chronicle known as the Festal Index. In § xv. of that document the following passage occurs: "In this year [342-43] the synod of Sardica was held; and when the Arians³ had arrived, they returned to Philippopolis, for Philagrius gave

¹ This more conciliatory policy was probably adopted in deference to Constantius. He was disgusted for the time by the scandal connected with Stephen, and he was frightened by the letters of his brother Constans, who threatened war if S. Athanasius and the other Eastern exiles were not restored to their sees.

² These are Liberius' words: "Significant Orientales paci nostrae velle conjungi. Quae est pax, clementissime imperator, cum sint ex partibus ipsis quatuor episcopi Demophilus, Macedonius, Eudoxius, Martyrius, qui ante annos octo, cum apud Mediolanum Arii sententiam haereticam noluisse damnare, de concilio animis iratis exierunt" (S. Hilar. *Fragm.* v. 4, *P. L.*, x. 684).

³ The Alexandrine author of the Festal Index naturally speaks of the whole body of bishops present at the Council of Philippopolis as "Arians."

them this advice there. In truth they were blamed everywhere, *and were even anathematized by the Church of Rome*, and having written a recantation to Pope Athanasius, Ursacius and Valens were put to shame."¹ The events of several years are compressed into this sentence, after the fashion of the author of the Festal Index.² The Council of Sardica took place in 343, and the letter of Valens and Ursacius was written to S. Athanasius in 347. The anathematizing of the Easterns by the Roman Church must have taken place between these two dates.³ Thus the general anathema, which had been pronounced against the West by the East at Philippopolis, was met by a counter-excommunication of the East, emanating from Rome.

Although both parties among the orthodox believers at Antioch remained out of the communion of the Roman Church until 375, the Eustathians under their priest, Paulinus, were admitted to the communion of the Alexandrine Church in 346. S. Athanasius stopped at Antioch to pay his respects to Constantius, before making his triumphal entry into Alexandria after his seven and a half years of exile. It would have been impossible for S. Athanasius to communicate with an Arian like Leontius, who no doubt held the saint to be a deposed and excommunicated person, and it would be no less impossible for Leontius to communicate with S. Athanasius. The Eustathians, as I have already observed, were Catholics, and quite within their rights in keeping apart from the heretical bishop; and S. Athanasius naturally communicated with them while in Antioch, and kept up communications with their leader from that time onwards.⁴

¹ Dr. Robertson's *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius*, p. 504, E. tr.

² See Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 501.

³ It seems to me *probable* that the excommunication of the Easterns took place after the abortive legation of the four Eastern bishops to the Council of Milan in 345. If those bishops had been already under the ban of excommunication, they would have hardly been allowed to communicate to the Fathers at Milan the fact that Photinus had been condemned at the Council of Antioch in 344. They evidently did make known at Milan this Eastern condemnation of Photinus, with the result that Photinus was also condemned at Milan by the Westerns. As the Eastern delegates refused to condemn Arius, they were no doubt excommunicated, and then, as Liberius informs us, they retired from the council in wrath. They represented the Eastern Church, and one can easily imagine that S. Julius may have thought the occasion opportune for fulminating an anathema against the whole East. Nine years afterwards Liberius grounded his refusal to communicate with the Easterns on the behaviour of their legates at Milan.

⁴ I think, however, that it is highly probable that S. Athanasius suspended his friendly relations with the Eustathians during the first twelve months of Paulinus' episcopate, that is to say from September, 362, to September or October, 363. S. Eusebius of Vercellae, the representative of S. Athanasius and of the Council of Alexandria, refused to communicate with Paulinus after his unfortunate

Nevertheless the great majority of the Antiochene Catholics continued to follow the counsel of S. Eustathius, and refused to secede from the communion of the bishop.¹ And this was the policy which was followed all over the East outside of Egypt. Dr. Gwatkin thus describes the situation in those regions: "The case of Antioch was not exceptional. Arians and Nicenes were still parties inside the Church rather than distinct sects. They still used the same prayers and the same hymns, still worshipped in the same buildings, still commemorated the same saints and martyrs, and still considered themselves members of the same church."² If this was true of the two parties which were most opposed to each other, the Nicene and the Arian, it was *a fortiori* true of the great middle party, to which the majority of the Eastern bishops belonged.

It seems desirable, if we are to comprehend the state of things in the midst of which S. Meletius was living before he became Bishop of Antioch, that we should get hold of some true notion of this middle party in the Eastern Church. The bishops, who composed it, were in fact the very bishops who had constituted the majority in the Council of Nicaea, or, if not those bishops themselves, then their successors and representatives. It seems that God, in His good Providence over His Church, so ordered matters that bishops, who in their fear of innovation would normally have objected to the insertion of the *ὁμοούσιον* and other new clauses into the creed, nevertheless voted for the insertion when they were at the council. But as soon as they came out of the council, they were alarmed at the work which they had done. They were substantially orthodox, they believed in the true Divinity of our Blessed Lord, but they had not the clear vision of S. Athanasius, and they feared that evil results would follow from the introduction of non-scriptural language into the creed. Moreover, they had been brought up in a school of doctrine which was specially sensitive on the subject of any

consecration by Lucifer; and the Benedictine editors of S. Basil in a note to that Saint's 214th epistle point out (*Opp.*, iii. 321) that S. Basil implies that S. Athanasius, when he was preparing to come to Antioch in the reign of Jovian, that is in September or October, 363, evidently did not favour the cause of Paulinus, but was "propensior . . . in Meletium."

¹ This state of promiscuous communion lasted at Antioch for thirty years, viz. from 331 to 361, as we may gather from two passages in the writings of Theodoret. In an epistle addressed to Bishop Domnus of Antioch (*Ep.* cxii., *P. G.*, lxxxiii. 1309), he says, "For thirty years those who adhered to the apostolic doctrines and they who were infected with the Arian blasphemy continued in communion with one another." And again in his Church History (ii. 27) he says, "For thirty years after the attack made upon the illustrious Eustathius they [the Catholics of Antioch] had gone on enduring the abomination of Arianism, in the expectation of some favourable change."

² *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 134, 135.

teaching which might be represented as Sabellianizing¹; and they thought that the *ὁμοούσιον* was capable of a Sabellianizing sense; and no doubt there was some ground for their fear. S. Hilary points out that the word is capable of several wrong senses, and among these he mentions first the Sabellian sense.² Moreover, the Orientals were persuaded that at least one of the leaders of the Nicene party, Marcellus of Ancyra, actually understood the term in a Sabellianizing way; and here again there is no doubt that they had good ground for their persuasion. S. Athanasius himself had in the end to write a treatise, which is mainly directed against the errors of Marcellus.³ But for a long while the Nicene party refused to admit that Marcellus' teaching was in any way censurable, and by the line which they took in regard to this matter, they not unnaturally excited the suspicions of the Easterns about their whole theological attitude.

As the middle party in the East was substantially Catholic in its belief, it was certain in time to discover that its true allies were S. Athanasius and the West, rather than the small body of crypto-Arian court-bishops, with whom it had continued to hold communion. It was the undisguisedly Arian character of the formula put forth by the small Council of Sirmium of the year 357⁴ which first led the middle party to realize the unmistakably heretical bias of these court-bishops. The impulse was then given, which "continued unchecked until the Nicene cause triumphed in Asia in the hands of the 'conservatives' of the next generation."⁵ Already in 359 S. Athanasius proclaimed the essential agreement which united the middle party with himself. "Those," he says, "who accept everything else that was defined at Nicaea, and doubt only about the *ὁμοούσιον*, must not be treated as enemies; nor do we here attack them as Ariomaniacs, nor as opponents of the Fathers, but we discuss the matter with them as brothers,

¹ See Dr. Robertson's *Prolegomena* (p. xxxv.) to his English translation of *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius*.

² Cf. S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, §§ 67, 68, *P. L.*, x. 525, 526. On the *ὁμοούσιον* as a theological formula, see Robertson's *Prolegomena*, pp. xxx. to xxxiii.

³ I refer, of course, to the so-called *Fourth Oration against the Arians* (see Newman's *Dissertatio de Quarta Oratione S. Athanasii contra Arianos* among the *Dissertationunculae critico-theologicae* in Newman's *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, edit. 1874, pp. 7 to 35. The *Monitum* to these *Dissertationunculae* is dated at Rome in 1847).

⁴ This was the formula which S. Hilary called "The blasphemy." See S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, § 11, *P. L.*, x. 487.

⁵ Robertson's *Prolegomena*, p. lv. In regard to the term "Conservative," as applied to the Eastern middle party, it may be well to mention that it was first brought into use by Dr. Gwatkin in his *Studies of Arianism*. Since the publication of his book it has been similarly applied by Harnack, Robertson, and others. Dr. Bright (*Waymarks in Church History*, pp. 368-371) criticizes this use of the word.

who mean what we mean, and dispute only about the word."¹

Included in the ranks of this middle party we find the names of holy persons, whom the Church has been accustomed to rank among the most venerated of her saints. Thus, for example, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, the author of the celebrated *Catechetical Lectures*, belonged to this party. He delivered those lectures while he was still a priest, and although he undoubtedly teaches in them the true Godhead of our Blessed Lord, yet he avoids the word *ἰσοούσιος*, fearing that Sabellianism and the cognate heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra lay hid within it.² In 350 or 351 he succeeded S. Maximus in the see of Jerusalem, his election having been apparently brought about through the influence of Acacius of Caesarea, the Metropolitan of Palestine, who no doubt acted as his principal consecrator.³ However, not long afterwards disputes about precedence and about jurisdiction arose between S. Cyril and Acacius; and in 357 the saint was deposed from his see by a council of Palestinian bishops, over which Acacius presided. S. Cyril was driven out of Jerusalem, and, having sent notice to his judges that he appealed to a higher tribunal, he took refuge with Silvanus of Tarsus. Silvanus was one of the leaders of the so-called Semi-Arian section of the middle party, and was a man of whom S. Basil always speaks "with unqualified reverence."⁴ Soon after S. Cyril's arrival at Tarsus, he took part in a council held at Melitene, in Armenia Secunda. There were two parties in the council, and S. Cyril appears to have sided with the minority, as he refused to recognize the validity of the council's action in deposing Eustathius of Sebaste, who was at that time acting with the Semi-Arians.⁵ In 359 S. Cyril found in the Council of Seleucia that higher tribunal,

¹ S. Athan., *De Synodis*, § 41. He goes on to mention specially, among these "brothers," Basil of Ancyra, the leader of those whom S. Epiphanius "with some injustice" names "Semi-Arians," and who were accustomed to put forth the word *ἰσοούσιος* as their test-formula.

² See Dom Touttée's *Dissertatio de Vita S. Cyrilli*, cap. iv. §§ 17-19, *Opp.* S. Cyrill. Hierosol., ed. Ben., coll. xi.-xv.

³ Dr. Hort (*Two Dissertations*, p. 92), after speaking of S. Maximus, says, "Cyril succeeded him as Acacius's nominee." Newman (Preface to the Oxford translation of the *Catechetical Lectures*, p. iii.) says, "It can scarcely be doubted that one of his consecrators was Acacius of Caesarea." See also Tillemont (viii. 429) and Gwatkin (*Studies*, p. 145). I have already pointed out (pp. 231, 232) that, although the Council of Sardica deposed Acacius and other Arian leaders, the action of the council failed to take effect; and it follows that Acacius remained, notwithstanding his unworthiness, the canonical Metropolitan of Palestine. Consequently the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople of 382 were able to say with truth that Cyril "was canonically ordained by the bishops of the province" (cf. Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 9).

⁴ Hort, *Two Dissertations*, p. 125.

⁵ See Sozomen (iv. 25) and S. Basil (*Ep.* cclxiii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 406).

to which he had appealed. The Semi-Arian majority in the council restored the saint to his see; but he was again deposed by the Homoean Council of Constantinople of the following year.¹ This brings us to within a few months of the election of S. Meletius to the see of Antioch, and I shall therefore refrain from tracing S. Cyril's history any further. What has been said will be sufficient to show that during his priesthood and the first ten years of his episcopate he belonged to that middle party which constituted the great bulk of the Eastern Church.² Dr. Robertson, describing the Church of Jerusalem during this first period of S. Cyril's episcopate, says that it "was orthodox substantially, but rejected the Nicene formula;"³ and he adds, "This was the case in the East generally, except where the bishops were positively Arian."⁴

S. Basil, whose name is even more illustrious than that of S. Cyril, and who ranks among the most accredited of the Church's doctors, was united by the closest ties with the bishops of the middle party. He was born in 329, and came of a family of saints. His paternal grandmother was S. Macrina the elder, who handed on to him in his childhood the holy teachings of S. Gregory the Wonder-worker, the great apostle of Pontus.⁵ His father was S. Basil the elder, and his mother was S. Emmelia; his sister was S. Macrina the younger, and his brothers were S. Gregory Nyssen and S. Peter of Sebaste. Brought up amid such surroundings, he imbibed from his youth the purest teachings of Catholic orthodoxy; and, as he says himself, he never held, and therefore never had to unlearn, any false opinions about God.⁶ Yet he was baptized and ordained reader by Dianius, the Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who had taken part in the Council of Philippopolis of 343, and had signed the encyclical of that council, in which Pope S. Julius of Rome was anathematized. From the date of the Council of Philippopolis until his death in 362 Dianius was out of communion with the Roman see, and S. Basil, who communicated with the Eastern bishops generally and with his own bishop, Dianius, in particular, was also separate from the Roman communion.⁷

¹ The Council of Constantinople did not profess to depose S. Cyril on doctrinal grounds; but because he had persisted in communicating with Eustathius of Sebaste, notwithstanding the action of the Council of Melitene. Compare Sozomen (iv. 25).

² He lived on till 386.

³ Compare with these words of Dr. Robertson Sozomen's statement (*H. E.*, iii. 13).

⁴ *Prolegomena*, p. xlix. Even where the bishops were positively Arian, they remained at this stage within the communion of the Church.

⁵ Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* cciv., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 306.

⁶ Cf. *Ep.* ccxxiii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 338.

⁷ S. Basil seems to have come into communion with S. Athanasius and the

Unfortunately, in the general confusion which followed the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia in 359, Dianius yielded to the pressure of the Emperor, and signed the creed of Ariminum. It was at that awful time, when, to use S. Jerome's words, "the whole world groaned and marvelled at finding itself Arian."¹ Cardinal Newman inserted in the last edition of his *Arians of the Fourth Century* a graphic description of the state of things that existed in Christendom in 360 and 361. He says, "The cause of truth was only not in the lowest state of degradation, because a party was in authority and vigour who could reduce it to a lower still; the Latins committed to an anti-Catholic creed, the pope a renegade, Hosius fallen and dead, Athanasius wandering in the deserts, Arians in the sees of Christendom, and their doctrine growing in blasphemy, and their profession of it in boldness, every day."² It was in the midst of this general defection of East and West that Dianius for the time succumbed. S. Basil tells us how grieved he was at this act of weakness committed by his beloved bishop; and for two years he seems to have kept away from that prelate, so that the report was even spread about that he had anathematized him. But S. Basil denied with vehemence that he had ever done such a thing, and characterized the report as a shameless and calumnious fiction.³

In 362, when Dianius was lying on his death-bed, he sent for Basil, who had been spending the two previous years in his monastery in Pontus, and assured him that he had assented to the formula of Ariminum in the simplicity of his heart, but that he had in no way purposed to do anything which should set aside the faith as it was expounded by the holy Fathers at Nicaea, and that he retained in his heart that which he had received from the beginning. He went on to say that he prayed that he might not be separated from the lot of those blessed 318 bishops who had proclaimed the orthodox teaching to the world. In consequence of this declaration, S. Basil and the monks who accompanied him suppressed

Church of Alexandria early in 363; but he did not receive any communications from Rome until 372.

¹ S. Hieron. *Dial. advers. Luciferianos*, § 19, P. L., xxiii. 172.

² Newman's *Arians*, edit. 1871, pp. 362, 363.

³ S. Bas. *Ep. li., Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 143, 144. Similarly S. Gregory Nazianzen did not feel himself bound in conscience to withdraw from the communion of his father, S. Gregory the elder, who was Bishop of Nazianzus, and who after a life of great sanctity was, at the age of eighty-two, cajoled into signing the creed of Ariminum, though in his heart he never swerved from the Catholic belief. Afterwards the old man made such reparation for his lapse as was possible; and he is commemorated as a saint in the Eastern Church on January 1 (cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. i. Jan., p. 21; and see S. Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xviii. § 18, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 342).

all inward hesitation and discussion, and communicated with the bishop, and ceased from their grief.¹

S. Basil's hesitation about communicating with his own bishop, when that bishop had signed what was really a heretical formula, adds force to the fact that he remained in full communion with the Eastern Church, notwithstanding her breach with the pope and the West, and that he was linked in bonds, not only of communion, but of friendship and religious co-operation with Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste, leaders of the Semi-Arian section of the Eastern middle party. He accompanied the first of these to Constantinople in 359, and seconded his efforts in the disputations which he held with the Arian champions.² With Eustathius of Sebaste S. Basil was on the most intimate terms for many years. His friendship with him began as early as 358. Later on we find them taking a journey together to visit "the blessed Silvanus" of Tarsus.³ In 364 Eustathius and other semi-Arian bishops, who were on their way to hold a council at Lampsacus, summoned Basil to meet them at Eusinoe. He obeyed the summons, and had much talk with them concerning the faith. Eustathius' most intimate disciples were continually coming to stay with Basil, and Eustathius himself used to spend days and nights in friendly colloquies with him at his mother's house. The friendship came to an end in 373 in consequence of Eustathius' unworthy conduct and his manifestation of heretical opinions.⁴

I think that what I have said shows incontestably that during the reign of Constantius, and even afterwards, S. Basil looked on the bishops of the so-called Semi-Arian section of the middle party as orthodox in their faith, and as being the legitimate Catholic occupants of their respective sees.⁵

But there were other orthodox and saintly members of

¹ S. Basil. *Ep.* li., *ut supra*.

² Dom Maran, *Vit. S. Bas.*, cap. vii. § 1, *Opp.* S. Bas., ed. Ben., tom. iii. p. lvi.

³ τὸν μακρόριον Σιλουανόν.—S. Bas. *Ep.* ccxxiii., *Opp.*, iii. 339.

⁴ Cf. S. Bas. *Ep.* ccxxiii., *ut supra*.

⁵ On the substantial orthodoxy of the majority of the Semi-Arians, see Jungmann (*Dissertationes Selectae in Hist. Eccl.*, ed. 1881, ii. 13) and the President of the Bollandists, Father De Smedt (*Dissertationes Selectae in primam aetatem Hist. Eccl.*, ed. 1876, pp. 276, 277). The latter, speaking of the Semi-Arians, says (*u. s.*), "Qui quidem, quoad rem ipsam, orthodoxam omnino fidem profitebantur, Verbum non creatum, sed ex Substantia Patris genitum affirmantes, at respuebant vocem *ὁμοούσιος* et rectius Filium Patri *ὁμοιούσιον* dicendum contendebant. Eos autem Patres illius temporis non haereticos sed orthodoxos reputabant, ut habetur ex testimoniis Athanasii, Hilarii et Basilii." See also p. 295 of the same work. Father De Smedt would of course not deny that a certain section of the Semi-Arians ultimately adopted, under the leadership of Macedonius, heretical opinions in regard to the Holy Ghost. But the majority were Catholic in belief, and ultimately accepted the full Nicene terminology. Stiltinck (*Acta SS.*, tom. vi. Septembr., p. 626) takes a similar view.

the Eastern middle party, who were bound by no special ties to the leaders of the Semi-Arian group. Such an one was S. Eusebius of Samosata. He was a bishop advanced in years, and was regarded by the younger generation of Catholics with extraordinary veneration. S. Gregory Nazianzen, writing to him in 370, calls him "a pillar and foundation of the Church," "a light in the world," "a crown of glorying for the sound party among Christians," "a gift of God," "a rule of faith," "an ambassador of truth," "all these things at once and more than all put together."¹ S. Basil says that in the midst of the afflictions of the Church his one consolation was to think of S. Eusebius ;² and that to enjoy his company for one day would be a viaticum sufficient to bring a man to salvation.³ And one might quote much more to the like effect. S. Eusebius passed four years in banishment on account of his opposition to Arianism ; and he met his death at the hands of an Arian woman, who hated him for his labours and sufferings on behalf of the faith. The Church honours him as a martyr.

S. Meletius of Antioch seems to have belonged to the same section of the middle party as S. Eusebius of Samosata. He was born at Melitene, the capital of the province of Armenia Secunda ; and it was probably at the Council of Melitene in 357 that he was consecrated to the see of Sebaste in Armenia Prima. That see had been held by the Semi-Arian leader, Eustathius, of whom I have spoken already. Eustathius was deposed twice during the reign of Constantius, once by the Council of Melitene in 357,⁴ and once by the Council of Constantinople in 360 ; and at one or other of these councils S. Meletius was appointed to be his successor. Various reasons make me think that the earlier of these two dates is most probably the true date of S. Meletius' consecration.⁵ In the first place, Melitene was the saint's native city. He seems to have belonged to a wealthy family of that place.⁶ The Council of Melitene, when it had deposed Eustathius, would naturally look about for a successor ; and a man of piety and position and popular gifts, who was living on the spot, would be just the sort of person whom they

¹ S. Greg. Naz. *Ep.* xlv., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 39.

² S. Bas. *Ep.* xxxiv., *Opp.*, iii. 113.

³ S. Bas. *Ep.* clxviii., *Opp.*, iii. 258. Dr. Hort (*Two Dissertations*, pp. 131, 132) says, "Basil's correspondence throughout his episcopate shows Eusebius [of Samosata] as his most intimate and trusted friend."

⁴ Cf. S. Bas. *Ep.* cclxiv., *Opp.*, iii. 406.

⁵ I must ask the reader's forgiveness for the length of the discussion as to the date of S. Meletius' consecration, on which I enter at this point. I am, however, anxious to clear S. Meletius from the suspicion of having been appointed to the see of Sebaste by the Homoean Council of Constantinople, held in 360.

⁶ Tillemont, viii. 342.

needed. It would be much less likely that the Council of Constantinople would fix upon an inhabitant of distant Melitene and give to him the equally distant see of Sebaste. But, again, it seems to me to be certain that S. Meletius, before his appointment to Antioch, resigned the see of Sebaste, "disgusted," as Theodoret says, "at the refractoriness of the people under his rule." Theodoret adds that, when he was elected to Antioch, he "was living without occupation elsewhere."¹ Socrates seems to confirm this account by telling us that Meletius "was translated" from Sebaste to Beroea in Syria.² It is true that Socrates was undoubtedly mistaken in his notion that S. Meletius occupied the see of Beroea. All other ancient writers speak only of the two sees of Sebaste and Antioch as having been successively held by him.³ But Socrates, at any rate, confirms the statement of Theodoret that S. Meletius had removed from Sebaste before being elected to Antioch. One can easily see that, if the consecration to Sebaste took place at Melitene in 357, the people of Sebaste, or at any rate a considerable section of them, would be likely to be refractory, because we have no reason to think that on that occasion Eustathius was banished, and we have good evidence that he treated his deposition as invalid. No doubt he remained at Sebaste, and was supported by his flock, and S. Meletius, when he got there, would soon discover that the position was an impossible one. It would be the most natural thing in the world that he should retire to Beroea or elsewhere. But after the Council of Constantinople in 360, the Semi-Arian leaders, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius, and the rest, who had been deposed by the council, were banished by the Emperor to various places.⁴ Eustathius was probably sent to Dardania,⁵ where he remained until the death of Constantius in November, 361. If, therefore, S. Meletius had been appointed to Sebaste by the Constantinopolitan council of 360, he would have found no rival on the spot to dispute his authority; and though he might have encountered some opposition from the partisans of Eustathius, a man with S. Meletius' gifts might hope to live down anything of that sort. It would, anyhow, be most unlikely that he would have resigned within a few months,

¹ Theodoret, *H. E.*, ii. 27.

² Socrat., ii. 44.

³ Among these writers may be mentioned S. Jerome, Rufinus, Theodoret, Sozomen, Philostorgius, and by implication S. Epiphanius. Socrates himself, in a passage (vii. 36) where he is giving a list of bishops who had been translated, says that "Meletius, after having presided over the Church of Sebaste, subsequently governed that of Antioch," thus omitting all mention of any intermediate translation to Beroea.

⁴ Philostorg, *H. E.*, v. 1.

⁵ See S. Bas. *Ep.* ccxxvi., *Opp.*, iii. 347; and observe the Benedictine note *in loc.*

although such a speedy resignation must be assumed to have taken place, if he was consecrated in 360; for some space of time must be allowed for his residence at Beroea, and he was elected to the see of Antioch in January, 361.

It is quite clear that Socrates supposed that S. Meletius was consecrated to Sebaste before the year 359; for he states that after his translation from Sebaste to Beroea he was present at the Council of Seleucia in 359, and there subscribed the Homoean creed set forth by Acacius.¹ Undoubtedly Socrates is mistaken in his facts. We know the names of the bishops who signed Acacius' creed,² and S. Meletius' name is not among them. Moreover, the signatories of the creed were all bishops occupying sees. But if Socrates is correct in his statement that S. Meletius had moved from Sebaste to Beroea before the meeting of the council, he must have been without a see; for, as we have seen, though he may very probably have lived for a time in retirement at Beroea, he was never Bishop of Beroea. He would, therefore, have had no *locus standi* in the council. He cannot have claimed to sit in right of the see of Sebaste, because Eustathius of Sebaste was one of the most prominent members of the council, and the question of Eustathius' right to his see would have been raised, if his rival had been present; but we hear nothing of any such controversy. It cannot, therefore, be doubted that Socrates was mistaken in supposing that S. Meletius took part in the Council of Seleucia; but it remains true that he believed that he was consecrated to the see of Sebaste, not after the second deposition of Eustathius in 360 by the Council of Constantinople,³ but at some date anterior to the year 359, and that date can only be the date of the Council of Melitene. Sozomen (iv. 25) seems to imply that Meletius was appointed to the Church of Sebaste after Eustathius' second deposition in 360;⁴ but it is quite possible that in saying what he does, he is founding on Socrates' vague

¹ Cf. Socrat., ii. 44.

² Cf. S. Epiph., *Haer.* lxxiii. 26, *P. G.*, xlii. 452, 453; and see Hefele's article on the *Meletian Schism* (Weltzer and Welte's *Dictionary of Catholic Theology*. French translation, 1861, xiii. 492).

³ In the preceding chapter (ii. 43) Socrates speaks of Eustathius' deposition by Eulalius of Caesarea, his own father. This must refer to a real or supposed deposition from the presbyterate (cf. Sozom. iv. 24). Socrates then goes on to say vaguely, "Let it be noted that Meletius was appointed bishop in place of Eustathius." It seems as if Socrates was not aware of the exact circumstances of Eustathius' first deposition from the episcopate. We, however, know from S. Basil that Eustathius' first deposition took place at the Council of Melitene (see the passage to which reference is made in note 5 on p. 237).

⁴ Neither Socrates nor Sozomen suggests that S. Meletius was consecrated at or by the Council of Constantinople in 360. Even if one could suppose that he was appointed by that council, it would still remain probable that he was in any case consecrated in Armenia.

statement, which I have quoted in note 3 on the previous page, and that he is confusing Eustathius' first deposition with his second.

On the whole it seems to me most probable that S. Meletius was appointed and consecrated to Sebaste by the bishops who sat in the Council of Melitene.¹ Who those bishops were, it is impossible to say. S. Cyril of Jerusalem is the only member of the council whose name is known;² and, as he sided with Eustathius, he certainly took no part in consecrating Eustathius' rival. We cannot say for certain whether the bishops who formed the majority of the council were Arianizers, or whether they belonged to the middle party. Speaking generally, the middle party was in a large majority throughout the East during this period. Presumably, therefore, the majority of the bishops at Melitene were not Arians. Tillemont argues that the council was assembled for the purpose of deciding questions connected with ecclesiastical discipline. He says that there is no indication of there having been any discussion of matters pertaining to faith.³ If so, the majority and minority may have been divided rather by personal predilections than by dogmatic differences.⁴ Even supposing that the majority of the council in fact sympathized with Arian doctrine, it must be remembered that up to that time the Arianizing bishops had not been excluded from the communion of the Eastern Church. The "indiscriminate communion" between Catholics and Arianizers, which had existed both in East and West before the Council of Sardica, and had been brought to an end in the West by that council, still continued in the East. The Arianizers were still a party within the Church, not a sect outside of it.⁵ Technically, they were legitimate Catholic bishops, although, in so far as they were personally tainted by heresy, they deserved to be deposed. It would follow that S. Meletius' consecration may have been, and probably was, just as "canonical" as the consecration of S. Cyril of Jerusalem by Acacius seven years earlier.⁶

¹ The Dominican, Le Quien (*Oriens Christianus*, i. 423), arrives at the same conclusion.

² See p. 237.

³ Tillemont, ix. 82.

⁴ It is not at all probable that Eustathius was deposed on the ground of any supposed doctrinal unsoundness. Even at Constantinople in 360 the Semi-Arian leaders were all deposed on disciplinary pretexts.

⁵ Dom Toutée (*Opp. S. Cyrill. Hierosol.*, col. xlv.), speaking of the year 358, says, "Semi-Ariani extra ecclesiae communionem non erant. Nullo publico ecclesiae iudicio, quod quidem executioni mandatum fuisset, damnati aut proscripti fuerant. In Oriente, ut vidimus, promiscua communio erat." What Dom Toutée says here of the Semi-Arians was true also of Acacius and his party. On this last point see Dom Maran's *Dissertation sur les Semi-Ariens* (*Bibliothec. Hist. Haeresiolog.*, ed. J. Vogt, 1729, tom. ii. pp. 148, 149).

⁶ See p. 237.

However, S. Meletius, as we have seen, did not remain long at Sebaste. He soon retired to Beroea. His real work as a bishop began in January, 361, when he was chosen to fill the great see of Antioch. We must proceed to consider the circumstances connected with his election to that see.

Among the prelates who met at Antioch in January, 361, to take part in the appointment of a bishop to preside over the church in that city, the most influential was without doubt Acacius. He had been the pupil of the historian, Eusebius of Caesarea, and after the death of his master in 338 he had succeeded him in his bishopric. He was able, clear-headed, energetic, but without convictions, and entirely unscrupulous. He has been called with good reason "the greatest living master of back-stairs intrigue."¹ So far as Acacius had any theological sympathies, they were probably with the Semi-Arians; but he was alienated from that party by circumstances connected with his official position. He was, as has been already mentioned, Metropolitan of Palestine; and it was natural for a man of his character, holding such an office, to quarrel with the bishop of the apostolic see of Jerusalem, which was situated within the limits of his province. It was his quarrel with S. Cyril which seems to have determined Acacius to set himself in antagonism to the Semi-Arian leaders, who were bound by various ties to his rival. Acacius therefore resolved to make the attempt to organize a new party which should combine various elements. He wished to gather into it those who, without using the full Nicene language, substantially held the Nicene faith; and he wished also to ally himself with the Arianizers. For this purpose he selected as the test word, which was to become the bond of union and the symbol of his party, the term *ὁμοιος* ("like"). The orthodox might understand this word to mean *like in substance*, which, with a benignant interpretation, might be explained as practically equivalent to *consubstantial*.² The Arianizers might understand it of a likeness of character, combined with a real unlikeness of substance. Thus the *ὁμοιον*, as understood by Arianizers, while seeming to contradict the *ἀνόμοιον* (unlike), really paved the way for it, and was in fact identical with it.

¹ Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 179.

² There is, I think, no reason to suppose that S. Meletius ever accepted the *ὁμοιον*. It was imagined by many in later times that he belonged to the Homoean party; but I believe that the rumour arose from the fact that Acacius presided at his enthronement at Antioch. Even when the great majority of the bishops, both in East and West, signed the creed of Ariminum, he probably escaped the test, as at that time he was living as a private person at Beroea. Dom Maran (*Vit. S. Bas.*, cap. x. § v., *Opp. S. Bas.*, tom. iii. p. lxxii.), speaking of certain bishops, who were accused of having signed the formula of Ariminum, says, "Nec S. Meletius videtur unquam hanc culpam commeruisse nec S. Cyrillus."

Of course Acacius did not state his plans explicitly. He was a master of intrigue, and he knew well how to put forward one side of his formula when speaking or writing to one set of men, and another side when speaking or writing to a different set. He made a special point of his avoidance of non-scriptural terms, such as *οὐσία*.

At the Council of Constantinople in 360 Acacius seized the reins and managed everything. He cast out of the Church the extreme Anomoean wing of the Arianizers; and, as we have seen, he deposed and procured the exile of the Semi-Arian leaders, and he persuaded the Emperor to enforce on all the bishops of the empire, whether in East or West, the signing of the formula of Ariminum, which sanctioned the *ὁμοιον* and condemned the use of the term *οὐσία*. The action of the council was practically all in favour of the more moderate Arianizers. Then Acacius set to work to propitiate the orthodox. The Arian historian, Philostorgius, says that Acacius, "when he had deposed and exiled Basil [the Semi-Arian Bishop of Ancyra] on account of private enmities, and Aetius [the Anomoean champion] on account of discrepancy of dogmas, returned to Caesarea, and on his way back appointed in the widowed churches bishops who professed the *ὁμοούσιον*." Philostorgius mentions that at Ancyra Acacius substituted in the place of [the Semi-Arian] Basil a certain Athanasius; that at Antioch he set up Meletius; and that at Laodicea he consecrated Pelagius;¹ and he adds that "wherever Acacius had the power, he advised and urged that those who most openly professed the *ὁμοούσιον* should be appointed in the place of the exiled" [bishops].² It may, perhaps, be doubted whether so early as 361 the test word *ὁμοούσιον* had been adopted by these bishops whom Acacius was appointing. But Philostorgius is no doubt substantially accurate in what he says about them. The nominees of Acacius at this juncture belonged to what may be called the extreme right of the middle party. They all took a leading part in the winning of the final victory of Nicene orthodoxy over Arianism in the East. For example, S. Basil speaks of Athanasius of Ancyra as being "a bulwark of

¹ Philostorgius also mentions that Acacius appointed Onesimus to Nicomedia, and a man of his own name, Acacius, to Tarsus; but nothing is known of these persons.

² Philostorg. *H. E.*, v. 1. In using the testimony of Philostorgius one must always remember that he was a bitter Arian of the most extreme type, and that he was utterly unscrupulous when relating the acts of those whom he disliked. I do not, however, see any reason for supposing that he either invented or coloured the facts for which I cite him in the text. And, indeed, the truth of Philostorgius' presentment of the case is thoroughly confirmed by what S. Epiphanius says in *Haer.* lxxiii. 28 (*P. G.*, xlii. 456).

orthodoxy,"¹ and "a pillar and foundation of the Church;"² and S. Gregory Nyssen praises him as "valuing the truth above everything."³ And similarly Pelagius of Laodicea is venerated as a saint both by East and West. He suffered banishment for the faith in 367, and after the second Ecumenical Council he was designated by the Catholic Emperor, Theodosius, as one of the bishops, communion with whom was to be a test of orthodoxy.

Thus, if it was a misfortune for S. Meletius, and in some sense a blot upon his record, that Acacius was mixed up with his election to the see of Antioch, yet those who lay stress on this blot should in all fairness mention the fact that his appointment took place at a time when Acacius found it convenient to choose out the most orthodox men in the Eastern Church for promotion to the episcopate; and that S. Meletius had as companions in misfortune a saint like Pelagius of Laodicea, and a "bulwark of orthodoxy" like Athanasius of Ancyra.

At this point in the narrative it seems desirable to consider the question of S. Meletius' complicity with Arian teaching. Dr. Rivington, writing on this subject, says, "Meletius had mixed himself up with the Arians to such an extent that they were justified in supposing that they were electing one of their own party. All the historians agree in speaking of his complicity with Arian teaching. It is supposed that Eusebius of Samosata had converted him."⁴ Now, it must of course be admitted that S. Meletius had been and was in communion with a considerable number of the Eastern Arianizers; but the same might be said of the whole Eastern Church⁵ and of all its many saints, including S. Eusebius of Samosata himself. The fact of such communion did not constitute a personal lapse on the part of Meletius, though

¹ S. Bas. *Ep.* xxv., *Opp.*, iii. 104.

² *Ep.* xxix., *Opp.*, iii. 109.

³ *Contra Eunomium*, lib. i. cap. 6, *P. G.*, xlv. 260.

⁴ *The Appeal to History*, a Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, 1893, p. 11.

⁵ I, of course, do not include Egypt in the Eastern Church at this time. During the Arian controversy S. Athanasius and Egypt constituted the centre of the Nicene party, and the West usually adhered to Egypt. But at the time of S. Meletius' election to Antioch the major part of the West had been ensnared into communion with the Arians, as the result of the Council of Ariminum in 359. Promiscuous communion was a more serious matter in the West than in the East. In the West it was a backsliding, after the Arians had been cast out at Sardica and at Milan. In the East events were tending towards a separation between the orthodox and the Arianizers, but the separation had not yet taken place, and therefore promiscuous communion was not necessarily a mark of declension from a higher level. As regards my use of the term Eastern Church, I follow Newman, who says (*Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, 1874, p. 199): "Under the name of East I include the countries from Thrace to the borders of Egypt." One may compare S. Basil (*Ep.* lxx., *Opp.*, iii. 163), who gives an exactly similar definition of the term.

one can easily imagine that the Eustathian party at Antioch did their best to affix a stigma to his name, as if he were in some special way responsible. S. Basil mentions that the followers of Paulinus were accustomed to make untruthful and partisan reports to the Westerns about the matters connected with S. Meletius;¹ and it happens that some of the earlier authorities for the history of the Antiochene schism would be in the way of hearing chiefly the Eustathian account of that schism. I refer specially to S. Jerome and Rufinus, and in a measure to S. Epiphanius. The historians of the fifth century, who lived at a time when within the limits of the Roman empire Arianism had been completely vanquished and cast out, would find it difficult to realize that for thirty years the Arianizers had been a party within the Church rather than a sect outside of it.² This difficulty of realizing the actual state of things would facilitate their acceptance of the Eustathian tradition as giving a true account of the matter.³

But among the historians of the fifth century there was one—I mean the Blessed Theodoret—who was specially well informed about the affairs of the Church of Antioch.⁴ Now, Theodoret tells us that, when the episcopal election at Antioch took place in January, 361, “the maintainers of apostolic doctrine were well aware of the soundness in the faith of the great Meletius, and they had clear knowledge of his bright innocence of life and of his wealth of virtue, and they came to a common vote, and took measures to have the instrument of election (*ψήφισμα*) written out and subscribed

¹ S. Bas. *Ep.* ccciv., *Opp.*, iii. 321.

² Compare Dr. Gwatkin's words quoted on p. 235.

³ We have already seen (see p. 243) that Socrates wrongly supposed that S. Meletius had put his name to the Homœan creed set forth by Acacius at the Council of Seleucia, and signed by the blasphemous Eudoxius, and about thirty-six others. This mistake of Socrates probably misled Sozomen, who numbers S. Meletius and that “bulwark of orthodoxy,” Athanasius of Ancyra, among the members of “the Eudoxian party” (Sozom. iv. 25). Sozomen, as appears from his account of the election of S. Meletius (iv. 28), entirely misconceived the state of things at Antioch. He speaks of the multitude who flocked around S. Meletius on his arrival, as being composed of Arians and of those who were in communion with Paulinus; whereas the majority was neither Arian nor Eustathian, but was composed of the Catholics who, under the guidance of S. Flavian and Diodorus, had remained in communion with the Arianizing bishops. Moreover, Sozomen says nothing about the presence of Acacius, although he was the chief person concerned with the election.

⁴ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. ii. Febr., p. 586. Theodoret was a genuine son of the Antiochene Church. He was born and baptized and brought up at Antioch, and at an early age was ordained a reader in the church there. During the thirty years of his episcopate at Cyrrhus he made twenty-six preaching visits to his native city. Thus he had every opportunity of gathering up the traditions of the Church of Antioch about S. Meletius. Moreover, he took special pains to collect particulars about S. Eusebius of Samosata. Cyrrhus lay between Antioch and Samosata (cf. Hort, *Two Dissert.*, p. 131).

by all without delay.”¹ No doubt Theodoret had previously said that “the Arian faction imagined that Meletius was of the same way of thinking as themselves, and that he was an upholder of their doctrines.” But S. Meletius’ famous sermon, in which, three or four weeks after his election, he confessed the true faith in the presence of the heretical Emperor, and his consequent exile, and his whole subsequent life make it perfectly clear that the orthodox of Antioch were well informed, and that the Arianizers were badly informed. Dr. Rivington suggests² that S. Meletius had been an Arian in the past, and that S. Eusebius of Samosata “had converted him,” and that “his conversion was kept a secret,” and that consequently the saint entered on his Antiochene episcopate “under false pretences.”³ Dr. Rivington must, one would think, have known very well that there is not a word of all this in the ancient writers.⁴ It seems a most extraordinary thing

¹ Theodoret. *H. E.*, ii. 27. The term *ψήφισμα*, as used in connexion with the election of bishops, denoted the decree of election passed by the electoral assembly, consisting of the clergy and people of the church whose see was vacant. The term was also used, as here, of the instrument recording the decree. Compare Bishop Rattray’s *Works*, pp. 382-392 (ed. G. H. Forbes, 1854). After the decree had been written out and subscribed, it was submitted to the synod of bishops, that the election might be confirmed (see Bingham’s *Antiquities*, IV. ii. 6).

² *The Appeal to History*, p. 11; compare also *Prim. Ch.*, p. 191, where occurs the following scandalous account of the *ψήφισμα*, which recorded S. Meletius’ election: “In view of what might happen, when his [S. Meletius’] conversion [to Catholicism] became known, the Catholics had a written document drawn up concerning his appointment by the Emperor Constantius.”

³ S. Meletius was, in all probability, living quietly at Beroea, and there is no reason to suppose that he took any part in the election or that he knew anything about it, until the fact that he had been elected was announced to him. He seems to have received that announcement in a message from the people of Antioch (*Socr.*, ii. 44) and by a summons from the Emperor (*Theodoret. H. E.*, ii. 27), and we may well believe that he also received a communication from the bishops who had confirmed his election. Is it credible that a conversion, fraudulently concealed for the purpose of obtaining a bishopric, could have been so blessed by God as to be followed up by that magnificent confession of the faith in the presence of the Emperor, and by the long life of sanctity which ensued?

⁴ S. Jerome accuses S. Meletius of hypocritical fraud, but he does not bear out Dr. Rivington’s statement in any particular. According to him, S. Meletius was elected as an Arian, and was exiled “most justly” because he had received back the priests whom Eudoxius, his predecessor, had deposed; whereupon S. Meletius suddenly changed his belief, in order that it might be supposed that he was being exiled for the faith (cf. S. Hieron., *Chronic.* ad ann. 364, *P. L.*, xxvii. 691). Considering that Eudoxius was the worst of all the Arians, it would almost certainly be a laudable act on the part of S. Meletius to restore any priests deposed by his predecessor. But the charge of fraud is absolutely inconsistent with what Theodoret relates about S. Meletius’ election, and with his whole subsequent life, and with the fact of his intimate friendship with S. Eusebius of Samosata and with S. Basil and with the other great Eastern saints of that age. It is a sad instance of the lengths to which the partisan spirit of the Eustathians went in their hatred of the holy man whom they calumniated. S. Jerome, who joined the Eustathians, and was ordained priest by Paulinus, no doubt learnt this tale from Paulinus’ followers. I will repeat here what the Jesuit, Father Böttalla, says

for one, who presumably wished to honour the saints, to adopt and propagate a theory which imputes to two such glorious saints as S. Meletius and S. Eusebius a conspiracy of fraud. The facts require no such improbable explanation. The simple solution is that the Arianizers, or some of them, made a mistake. Probably they thought that, as S. Meletius did not belong to the semi-Arian party,¹ he assuredly held the Homocan form of misbelief; whereas he was really Nicene in faith, and was soon to be Nicene in phraseology. For my part, I firmly believe that the clear-headed Acacius knew all along that S. Meletius was orthodox. It was his policy at that particular juncture to promote the appointment of orthodox bishops. He had already appointed Athanasius at Ancyra, and he was going shortly to appoint S. Pelagius at Laodicea, and it fits in perfectly with his general line of action at this time, that he induced the bishops, the majority of whom were possibly Arianizers,² to confirm the election which had been made by the Church people of Antioch, the great majority of whom were certainly Catholic. It is quite conceivable that Acacius may have deceived his Arianizing brethren, and may have imputed to Meletius heretical opinions which he did not hold, but the wily intriguer himself doubtless knew what was the real state of the case, and was in no way astonished at S. Meletius' later career.³

(*Infallibility*, p. 185) of S. Jerome: "This holy Doctor's tendency to give too ready credence to unauthorized rumours is well known. Thus, as is pointed out by Zaccaria, . . . he adopts the falsehoods spread abroad by the adherents of Paulinus to the prejudice of S. Meletius of Antioch." The passage from Zaccaria, himself a Jesuit, occurs in his *Dissert. de Commentit. Liberii Lapsu*, cap. vi., ap. Petav. *Dogm. Theol.*, edit. 1865, tom. iii. p. 580. The whole passage is important.

¹ The fact of his acceptance of the see of Sebaste after Eustathius' deposition would show that he did not belong to the semi-Arian group, and would keep him separate from it.

² We know the names of only three of the bishops, who had gathered in considerable numbers at Antioch, and took part in the confirmation of S. Meletius' election. They were Acacius of Caesarea, George of Laodicea, and S. Eusebius of Samosata. These three were bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch. George was also a bishop of what may be called the "home" province of that patriarchate, namely, *Syria Prima* (cf. Sozom., iv. 12). The first two were Arianizers, the third was orthodox. Hefele (Wetzer and Welte's *Dictionary of Catholic Theology*, French translation, 1861, tom. xiii. p. 492) seems to think that there were other orthodox bishops present. Whether that was so, I cannot say. The important point to notice for our present purpose is, that the three, whose names are known, were the canonical occupants of their sees. They had none of them been canonically deposed, although Acacius and George richly deserved that penalty. The proceedings at Seleucia in 359 had been annulled at Constantinople in 360. With reference to what has been said in this note, it may be well to add that in my opinion no weight ought to be attached to Sozomen's assertion (Soz., iv. 28) that Eudoxius took part in the election of S. Meletius. Eudoxius did not belong to the patriarchate, and Sozomen seems to have substituted his name for Acacius' in the account of the election.

³ Even Sültilnck allows that S. Meletius was perfectly orthodox. He says

But it may perhaps be asked in reply, Why, then, did the Eustathians refuse to accept S. Meletius as their bishop? Does not their action show that they were convinced of his heterodoxy?¹ To that I answer that his sermon and his consequent exile must have convinced them, if they needed convincing, that his faith was substantially orthodox. The objection, which the more moderate among them raised, was not in regard to S. Meletius' personal faith, but in regard to the fact that he had been elected by persons who had been baptized by Arianizers, and that his consecration to Sebaste had been performed, and his election to Antioch had been confirmed, by bishops, some of whom were actual Arianizers, and all of whom communicated with Arianizers.² From the beginning the Eustathians had based what may be called their denominational existence on their assertion of the iniquity of promiscuous communion. I think that there was a great deal to be said in favour of their contention. But I confess that they were in too great a hurry, and that they were too absolute in their view. The Church is a large body, and must be allowed to take time. The Western Church waited twelve years before it broke off from all communion with

(*Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Septembr., p. 528): "Ille multis erat suspectus de haeresi Arianâ, licet revera probe esset Catholicus."

¹ If we are to believe Sozomen (iv. 28), the Eustathians "shouted aloud and rejoiced and leaped" in their enthusiasm, when they heard S. Meletius' famous sermon.

² See Socrat., ii. 44, and v. 5. S. Eusebius of Samosata, orthodox as he was, made no difficulty about joining with Acacius and his Arianizing friends in the synod or episcopal meeting which confirmed S. Meletius' election. So long as the Arianizers remained a party within the Church, such a course was natural. No doubt it was a state of things which could not last permanently. The great Head of the Church was sure in the end to purify His Church from all communion with a party denying the fundamental truth of His equality with the Father. But S. Eusebius knew how to wait for God's time. It ought to be specially easy for Roman Catholics to understand the slowness of the Church in her dealing with the Arianizing party. The Roman Church had to bear with the presence of large bodies of Jansenists in her communion for more than a century after she had condemned their tenets as heretical. And again, after the Fifth Ecumenical Council had been accepted and confirmed by the Roman see, that see remained in communion with various Western churches which refused to be bound by the Fifth Council. Similar remarks may be made in regard to the action of the Roman see towards those Western churches which refused to acknowledge the ecumenicity of the Nicene Council of the year 787. Once more, Pius IX., in a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Munich on October 28, 1870, called the doctrine of papal infallibility, "*ipsam fundamentale principium catholicae fidei ac doctrinae*" (see Döllinger's *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees*, English translation, 1891, p. 101), yet Rome allowed the Gallican Church to remain in her communion, notwithstanding that church's public repudiation of this "fundamental principle of the Catholic faith." One would be justified in saying that the plan of tolerating within her communion the co-existence of divergent views on questions of the highest importance, bearing on faith and morals, has been reduced to a kind of system by the Roman Church. It must be confessed that in regard to some departments of revealed truth the English Church has been too ready to follow the example set by her Roman sister.

Arianizers. The Eastern Church waited thirty years before it came to a similar decision. It was the sectarian impatience of the Eustathians which led them to repudiate the saint whom God had raised up to be their bishop; and that repudiation must be regarded as a calamity for them, but not as a slur upon him.

Moreover the adverse judgement, which the Eustathians passed on the validity of S. Meletius' election is entirely outweighed by the favourable judgement which S. Basil passed upon it. In a letter written by him to S. Epiphanius in the year 377 or thereabouts, he said that his Church of Caesarea had always communicated with S. Meletius, and had had an ardent love for him on account of his staunch and unyielding opposition to Arianism. S. Basil went on to say that when "the most blessed Pope Athanasius" had come from Alexandria and was making a stay in Antioch, he greatly desired that intercommunion between himself and S. Meletius should be successfully established; but that, in consequence of the incapacity of S. Meletius' counsellors, this reunion was put off to another season. Here S. Basil inserts in his letter the exclamation, "Would that this had not happened." Then he adds, "We have never admitted the communion of those who came in afterwards"¹—he means Paulinus and his followers, and perhaps also Vitalis and his followers—"not that we judged them to be unworthy, but because we had no reason for condemning him"² (that is, Meletius). Of course, if S. Meletius' original consecration to Sebaste or his subsequent election to Antioch had been vitiated either by his personal heresy, or by the intervention of bishops who had been canonically deposed and excommunicated in consequence of heresy, S. Basil could not have written as he did.³ In that case there would have been good reason for regarding S. Meletius' position as unsatisfactory. But S. Basil knew well that such was not the case. I cannot indeed doubt that he would have admitted that it was unfortunate for Meletius that two such men as Acacius and George should have been

¹ The consecration of Paulinus took place more than a year and a half after the accession of S. Meletius to the throne of Antioch.

² Cf. S. Bas. *Ep.* cclviii., *Opp.*, iii. 394. S. Basil had special opportunities for knowing all the circumstances connected with S. Meletius' election, because he was the bosom friend of S. Eusebius of Samosata, who had taken such a prominent part in that election. Moreover, all the great Eastern saints of that age shared in S. Basil's view of the matter.

³ One can gather what S. Basil's feelings would have been in such a case from a passage in his 240th epistle (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 370), where he says, "I do not acknowledge as bishop, nor would I number among the priests of Christ, one who was put forward into the position of ruler by profane hands for the overthrow of the faith. This is my judgement." It is evident, from a passage like this, that S. Basil must have regarded S. Meletius' election to Antioch as having been substantially an election by Catholics, as in fact it was.

mixed up with his election and institution to his see. Their intervention constituted a spot upon the transaction whereby S. Meletius attained to his high position;¹ but that misfortune arose from the circumstances of the time, and from the state in which the Eastern Church then was. Though it gave a handle to S. Meletius' enemies, it in no way vitiated his own canonical status. He was, in S. Basil's view, the only legitimate Bishop of Antioch.

At the time of S. Meletius' election there can be no question that the Church of Antioch was predominantly catholic. There was indeed an Arianizing party,² but they were in a minority.³ It was the Catholic majority which had secured the happy choice; and the instrument of election was consequently entrusted to S. Eusebius, who was the leading Catholic prelate in the synod of bishops. S. Chrysostom tells us of the joy with which S. Meletius was received by the body of the faithful on his entry into the city. From that day forward "Meletius" became the favourite name which parents gave to their children. Moreover, they engraved his likeness on their seals and rings, and they carved it on their bowls, and painted it on the walls of their bed-chambers. Rather less than a month after his entry he was banished by the Emperor, who was indignant at his outspoken orthodoxy. But within the limits of that short time he had "delivered the city from the error of heresy, and had cut off the putrefying and incurable members from the rest of the body, and had brought back vigorous health to the multitude of the Church."⁴

¹ S. Gregory Nazianzen, who had the highest admiration for S. Meletius, and was in full communion with him, touches very gently in one line of his *Carmen de Vita sua* (line 1523, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 754) on the damage wrought "by the alien hand." But this line occurs as the foil to the fervent panegyric of our saint, in the midst of which it is embedded. The close union of the two saints appears from the fact that it was partly in consequence of S. Meletius' exhortations that S. Gregory undertook his mission work in Constantinople, and that it was by S. Meletius' hands that S. Gregory was installed in the episcopal throne of the church in that city.

² In the election of S. Ambrose to the see of Milan there seems to have been a similar concurrence of the two parties, the Catholics and the Arians. S. Ambrose's secretary and biographer, Paulinus, speaking of the people of Milan, says (*Vit. Ambr.*, § 6, *P.L.*, xiv. 31) quite plainly, "ita qui antea turbulentissime dissidebant, quia et Ariani sibi et Catholici sibi episcopum cupiebant, superatis alterutris, ordinari, repente in hunc unum mirabili et incredibili concordia consenserunt." We may gather from S. Hilary (*Lib. contra Auxent.*, § 12, *P.L.*, x. 616) that in 364 there were Catholics in Milan, who communicated with Auxentius. Such communion was, however, exceptional in the West.

³ Dr. Gwatkin (*Studies of Arianism*, p. 133), speaking of the state of things during the episcopate of Leontius, whose death occurred in 357, says, "The Arians were in a minority even in the larger congregation which adhered to Leontius."

⁴ S. Chrys. *Hom. in S. Melet.*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 519. S. Chrysostom had been an eye-witness of what he here describes; for he was born and brought up

I have already referred several times to the great sermon which drew down on S. Meletius the wrath of the Emperor. It was preached in his presence; and even Dr. Rivington admits that "it was a splendid piece of bravery in defence of the Catholic faith."¹ But Dr. Rivington goes on to mention as a set-off on the other side that there were in it "expressions which would not have passed muster with S. Athanasius." As he gives no references, one is compelled to guess at the expressions which he deems reprehensible, or at any rate non-Athanasian. Probably he is referring to some criticisms of the sermon hazarded by S. Epiphanius,² whose principal objection seems to be based on the fact that S. Meletius applied to our Lord in His Divine Nature the celebrated passage, in which the Septuagint translator of the Book of Proverbs represents Wisdom as saying, "The Lord created (or begat) me a beginning of His ways for His works."³ It is no doubt true that S. Athanasius was accustomed to apply this passage to our Lord in His Manhood. But, as Petavius observes in his note, "Meletius ought not to be condemned because he interpreted that text from Prov. viii., as referring to the uncreated Wisdom and to the Word of God; for many of the Fathers have done the same."⁴ Certainly, if S. Meletius erred, he erred in good company. For example, Pope S. Dionysius of Rome has always been considered a specially accurate writer on all matters connected with the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and with the doctrine of our Lord's true Godhead. But S. Dionysius agreed with S. Meletius in interpreting Prov. viii. 22 as referring to our Lord in His Divine Nature.⁵ So again S. Thomas Aquinas, in his explanation of the Scripture passages adduced by Arius in defence of his heresy, sets forth three interpretations of Prov. viii. 22, as being in his opinion tenable. According to the first interpretation, the wisdom spoken of by

by his Christian mother in Antioch. If the Bollandists are right, he would be seventeen years old in the year of S. Meletius' election; and with the Bollandists agrees Mgr. Batiffol (*La Littérature Grecque*, p. 240). Others suppose that S. Chrysostom was fourteen in the year 361.

¹ *The Appeal to History*, p. 12.

² S. Epiph., *Haer.* lxxiii. cap. 35, *P. G.*, xlii. 468.

³ Prov. viii. 22 in the LXX. The Emperor Constantius had required that the sermon should be preached on that text.

⁴ Cf. S. Epiph., *loc. cit.* Migne has reprinted Petavius' edition of S. Epiphanius' works in the *Patrologia Graeca*.

⁵ Cf. *Fragment. Op.* Dionys. Pap. *adv. Sabellianos*, § 2, *P. L.*, v. 116. Father Bottalla, speaking of this fragment, goes so far as to say that "the declaration of Pope Dionysius was really an infallible utterance" (Bottalla, *Infallibility of the Pope*, p. 160). S. Dionysius' interpretation of the passage in Proverbs differs from S. Meletius' interpretation, and in fact stands quite alone among patristic explanations of the verse; but, as I have said in the text, it agrees with S. Meletius' view in applying the Greek version of the inspired words to our Lord in His Divine Nature.

Solomon is the wisdom which God poured out upon all His works,¹ and is not to be identified with our Lord. According to the second interpretation, the Wisdom is explained as referring to our Lord in His Human Nature. According to the third interpretation, the "creation" of Wisdom is expounded to mean the eternal generation of the Son.² Thus S. Thomas mentions as tenable the view held by S. Athanasius, and also the view held by S. Meletius. If any one is inclined to hold that S. Epiphanius is right in attributing some possible measure of blame to S. Meletius for applying the passage in the Book of Proverbs to our Lord in His Divine Nature, he had better consider first whether the adverse opinion of S. Epiphanius is not enormously outweighed by the favourable opinions of S. Dionysius, S. Thomas, and Petavius. Anyhow, whether or no a superfine criticism is able to pick holes successfully in two or three details of S. Meletius' phraseology,³ it is allowed on all hands that in the face of the heretical Emperor he proclaimed in substance the Catholic faith, and that in consequence he was banished to Armenia, where he remained for more than a year and a half.

As soon as the true bishop had been banished, some of the Arianizing court-prelates went through the form of deposing him, and then in concert with the Emperor intruded Euzoïus, one of the original companions of Arius, into the patriarchal throne. Euzoïus was a condemned heretic.⁴ And even apart from that disability his pretended institution to

¹ Cf. *Ecclus.* i. 9.

² Cf. S. Thom. *Summ. contra Gentiles*, lib. iv. cap. 8. S. Thomas, when setting forth the third interpretation, says, "Per hoc quod sapientia et creata et genita nuncupatur, modus divinæ generationis nobis insinuatur."

³ Of course S. Meletius refrained from the use of the word *ὁμοούσιος*. It is quite possible that he still shared the Eastern dislike of the term, as being one that was liable to be abused so as to favour the heresies of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, and Marcellus. In any case, it would have been most unwise if he had used it under the circumstances; and such premature action would have been in every way blamable. The appropriate time for its official adoption at Antioch came two years later, as will be set forth further on (see pp. 291-293). S. Hilary dwells on the danger of the premature use of the word in his *De Synodis* (cap. 69, *P. L.*, x. 526), where he says, "Dicturus unam Catholicis substantiam Patris et Filii, non inde incipiat: neque hoc quasi maximum teneat, tanquam sine hoc vera fides nulla sit." Similarly, S. Athanasius avoids using the word in his *Orations against the Arians*. Newman (Oxford translation of the *Orations*, p. 499; compare also *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, pp. 290-292) says that the *ὁμοούσιος* cannot be said to occur anywhere in the first three *Orations*, for "i. 9 is rather a sort of doctrinal confession than a part of the discussion." The so-called fourth *Oration*, though it was written by S. Athanasius, is a distinct work of a later date. The primitive saints thoroughly understood the principle of "reserve," and the duty of acting upon it, when the circumstances seemed to call for it.

⁴ Euzoïus, who had in early life been a deacon of the Church of Alexandria, was anathematized and deposed from the diaconate by nearly a hundred Egyptian bishops in 320 or 321. The Council of Nicaea ratified the sentence against him; and he had never been restored by any competent authority.

the see of Antioch was absolutely uncanonical. S. Meletius had not resigned, and his deposition had been a mere farce, and therefore the see was occupied. It was impossible for the Catholics of Antioch to recognize as their bishop one who was schismatically invading the diocese which belonged to another; and though they had borne with a bishop like Eudoxius, who taught the full Arian blasphemy, but had not been formally condemned for his heresy, they rightly shrank from communicating with one who had been excommunicated *nominatim* by the bishops of his own province and afterwards by an Ecumenical Council. And so it came to pass that after thirty years of promiscuous communion the Church of Antioch heard and obeyed the Divine call to come out and be separate. Now it was seen how well the two zealous laymen, S. Flavian and Diodorus,¹ had done the work which they had undertaken—the work, I mean, of encouraging the Catholic people of Antioch to cling to the true faith during the tyranny of the Arian bishops; and it was also seen how striking had been the impression which Meletius had made during his month of residence; for the larger part of the Christian people of Antioch were content, for the sake of the truth of our Lord's Godhead, to give up the church-buildings, which they loved, to Euzoïus and his Arian followers, and to assemble for their solemn worship in the open fields² outside the city. Assuredly such an act of faith, carried out on such a large scale, must have drawn down a rich blessing from God upon the church, which at such a cost was witnessing on behalf of the truth.

I am inclined to think that Dr. Rivington is right, when he suggests³ that S. Gregory of Nyssa is referring to Euzoïus, and not to Paulinus, in the passage in which he speaks of some person attempting to corrupt the chastity of the Church of Antioch, which Church, however, remained faithful to her pastor, S. Meletius, who was espoused to her.⁴ In the first

¹ S. Flavian was afterwards ordained priest by S. Meletius, and finally succeeded him in the see of Antioch. Diodorus, later on in his life, became the instructor of S. Chrysostom and the friend of S. Basil, and, it must also be added, the teacher of Theodore of Mopsuestia. He died Bishop of Tarsus.

² It was in consequence of this circumstance that the Antiochene Catholics were during the greater part of S. Meletius' episcopate nicknamed the *Campeuses*, or field-party. It was probably not until after the death of Constantius that they took possession of the Church of the Apostles in old Antioch (ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ). See Tillemont, viii. 764. They were again driven out into the fields by Valens in 372, and there is a description of the hardships which they had to endure during the winter of 372–373 in the letter, probably written by S. Meletius, which is numbered 242 among the letters of S. Basil (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 371, 372).

³ *The Appeal to History*, pp. 15, 16.

⁴ S. Gregory Nyssen (*Orat. Funebr. in S. Melet.*, P. G., xlvi. 857), speaking of S. Meletius and of the Church of Antioch, says, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐνήθλει τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς

two editions of this book (p. 166), I explained the passage as referring to the consecration of Paulinus by Lucifer. I had good authority for my interpretation. It is supported by Tillemont,¹ by Le Quien,² and by the Bollandist, Van den Bosche.³ Dr. Rivington's arguments in favour of the reference to Euzoïus do not impress me; but on other grounds I think that his conclusion is correct. Euzoïus really did make an attempt to subject to himself the great Church of Antioch. He posed as the successor of S. Meletius, who, as he no doubt contended, had been canonically deprived; the church-buildings were handed over to him by the civil power; and the Catholics, if they were to avoid being contaminated by schism and heresy, had by a definite act to withdraw from his communion. There was a moment, immediately after Euzoïus' consecration, when the fidelity of the Antiochene church to her spouse, S. Meletius, might seem to tremble in the balance; and we may be morally sure that Euzoïus continued his efforts to ensnare S. Meletius' flock during the whole period of the saint's banishment. But Paulinus was at no time anything more than the bishop of the comparatively small body of the Eustathians. He was consecrated more than a year and a half after S. Meletius, and there was never any moment when there was the smallest chance of the Church of Antioch leaving S. Meletius for him. Consequently the figurative language of S. Gregory Nyssen is in every way more appropriate to the intrusion of Euzoïus than to the intrusion of Paulinus. As there is so much in Dr. Rivington's polemic, which seems to me to be based on a misreading of the history, I the more rejoice to find myself, in regard to this matter, in accord with him.

εἰσεβείας ἰδρῶσιν' ἡ δὲ ὑπέμενεν ἐν σωφροσύνῃ τὸν γάμον, φυλάττουσα. Χρόνος ἦν ἐν μέσῳ πολλὸς, καὶ τις μοιχικῶς κατεπεχειρεῖ τῆς ἀχράντου παστᾶδος. Ἄλλ' ἡ νύμφη οὐκ ἐμυαίνεται, καὶ πάλιν ἐπάνοδος, καὶ πάλιν φυγή· καὶ ἐκ τρίτου ὡσαύτως, ἕως διασχῶν τὸν αἰρετικὸν ζύφον ὁ Κύριος, καὶ τὴν ἀκτίνα τῆς εἰρήνης ἐπιβαλὼν, ἔδωκεν ἀνάπανσιν τινα τῶν μακρῶν πόνων ἐλπίζειν.

¹ Tillemont, viii. 356.

² *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 715.

³ *Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Jul., p. 54.

LECTURE VIII.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—II.

The Council of Alexandria, held in the year 362.

ABOUT nine months after the banishment of S. Meletius, on the 3rd of November 361, Constantius died of fever at Mopsucrene, in Cilicia; and Julian the Apostate, who was already in rebellion against his imperial kinsman, succeeded to the throne of the Roman empire. The substitution of a heathen in place of a heretical emperor brought immediate relief to the Church. Within two months of his accession Julian gave permission to the bishops, who had been sent into exile by Constantius, to return to their sees. A new chapter in the history of the Church had begun.

The relief came none too soon. The state of things in Christendom was heart-breaking. Cardinal Newman has described it in eloquent words in a passage which has already been quoted.¹ Two streaks of light had, however, appeared on the horizon, even before the death of Constantius. In the first place, there was the revival of orthodoxy in Gaul under the guidance of S. Hilary, after his return from Constantinople in 360. Many of the Gallican bishops, who had signed the Ariminian formula, were brought back by him to repentance and reformation; councils were held; and heretics, such as Saturninus of Arles and Paternus of Perigueux, were deposed.² And then, secondly, there was the separation of

¹ See p. 239.

² Cf. Sulpic. Sever. *Hist. Sacr.* ii, 45, *P. L.*, xx, 155. Probably Sulpicius Severus condenses into a short statement the record of events which were really spread over two or three years. But the movement of revival in Gaul was at any rate begun before the death of Constantius. It is to be noted that S. Jerome, in his *Chronicon* (*P. L.*, xxvii, 691), inserts the following entry: "Gallia per Hilarium Ariminensis perfidiae dolos damnat." S. Jerome places this entry between his notice of the elevation of S. Meletius to the see of Antioch and his mention of the death of Constantius. In other words, he points to the year 361 as the central date connected with the restoration of Catholicism in Gaul. S. Hilary's work would probably be facilitated by Julian's open apostacy from Christianity during the spring or early summer of 361. This apostacy took place while Julian was still in Gaul.

the Catholics from the Arians at Antioch, the most important city of the East, which had come about, as we have seen, in consequence of the deposition of S. Meletius by the Arians, and their intrusion of Euzoïus into his see. Elsewhere all was dark. S. Athanasius was hiding with the monks in the cells of Nitria or of the Thebaid. Liberius was, it is true, at or near Rome, but his return to his see had been purchased by a shameful subscription,¹ so that, having fallen himself, he was not in a position to take the lead in rehabilitating others who had fallen. The bishops generally, both in East and West, were with few exceptions tainted with the taint of Ariminum. Such was the state of things when Julian's edict recalled the banished bishops to their sees.

It was on February 21, 362, that S. Athanasius got back to Alexandria, and he at once became the natural centre and leader for the main body of the little band of confessors, who had signed no heretical formula, and who desired now to do what they could to extricate the Church from the terrible condition into which she had fallen. To Alexandria naturally gravitated the bishops who had been banished by Constantius for their adherence to the Catholic faith. I speak, of course, of the exiles who belonged to the communion of S. Athanasius. Eastern confessors, such as S. Meletius of Antioch, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, and others, who in the East may have kept themselves clear of the taint of Ariminum, would look to Antioch rather than Alexandria as their centre; and, moreover, their former communion with Arianizers would make them objects of suspicion to Athanasius, just as his refusal to anathematize Marcellus made him an object of suspicion to them. It was impossible at this stage for the whole body of exiled confessors to meet in one synod. However, twenty-one bishops did meet at Alexandria under S. Athanasius' presidency during the course of the summer of 362. Almost all of them belonged to the Alexandrian patriarchate; but there was one Eastern, S. Asterius of Petra, in Arabia,² who had sided with S. Athanasius and the West ever since the split which followed the Council of Sardica; and there was one illustrious Western, S. Eusebius of Vercellae. It would have been well if S. Eusebius could have persuaded another

¹ Cf. Sozom. *H. E.*, iv. 15. Duchesne (*Lib. Pont.*, i. 209), speaking of Sozomen's account of the Sirmian meeting in 358, says that that writer "a eu sur cette affaire des documents officiels et de première main." Every candid student of that account will, I think, come to the same conclusion. De Rossi also (*Bulletino di Archeologia Christiana*, 1883, pp. 54, 55) evidently attaches great importance to Sozomen's evidence about Liberius' signature. On the whole subject of Sozomen's account of Liberius' fall, see Appendix G, pp. 275-287.

² S. Asterius had been exiled after the Council of Sardica to Upper Libya (S. Athan., *Hist. Arian.*, § 18).

Western exile, Lucifer of Caralis, who had shared with him his banishment in the Thebaid, to accompany him to the Alexandrine Synod.¹ But Lucifer did not care to wait for the decisions to which the assembled Fathers would be guided. He had his own clear view of what the situation demanded, and he hurried off to Antioch to carry out his short-sighted policy.² He however, sent two of his deacons to represent him at the synod. Two deacons were also sent from Antioch by Paulinus, the leader of the Eustathians;³ and certain monks from Laodicea attended the synod on behalf of Apollinarius.

The Council of Alexandria, though small in numbers, did a work of the highest importance. The band of confessors who were there assembled defined the terms on which they would receive into their communion the bishops who had in any way been polluted by Arianism. In point of fact, almost the whole episcopate of the Catholic Church both in East and West, had been, ever since the Council of Ariminum, in a tainted condition,⁴ when judged from the strict standpoint of S. Athanasius and of the other Fathers of the Council of Alexandria. I have already referred to the fact that, from the standpoint of the Eastern confessors the Fathers of Alexandria were themselves tainted because of their communion with Marcellus. At the Alexandrine Synod opinions were divided. Some were in favour of a narrow exclusive policy, admitting only to lay communion bishops who had in any way contracted the Arian taint.⁵ Others took a broader and more generous line. They would reduce to lay communion only those converts who had been leaders of the heretical party and defenders of the heresy. Other tainted bishops should be allowed to retain their sees and their episcopal dignity, on condition that they abjured the Arian heresy and signed the decrees of Nicaea. It need

¹ S. Hilary in Gaul and Gregory of Elvira in Spain were too far away to be able to attend the Council of Alexandria.

² Dom Montfaucon (*Vit. S. Athanasii*, ad ann. 362, § 13, *Opp. S. Athan.*, ed. Ben., 1777, tom. i. p. lxxxii.) expresses the opinion that Lucifer refused to attend the Council of Alexandria because he foresaw that it would deal generously with the bishops who were tainted by communion with Arians.

³ It will be remembered that from the year 346 onwards Paulinus and his little flock had been in the communion of S. Athanasius. They were still outside the communion of Rome, from which indeed they would, no doubt, have shrunk in consequence of Liberius' fall. Paulinus and his followers must have modified the rigidity of their principles after their acceptance of the decrees of the Council of Alexandria. However, there is no reason to believe that they ever, in fact, communicated directly with Liberius.

⁴ A vivid account of some of the things which took place at the Council of Ariminum, and of the results of that council, is given by S. Jerome in his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, §§ 17-19 (*P. L.*, xxiii. 170-174).

⁵ Rufin. *H. E.*, i. 28, *P. L.*, xxi. 498.

not be said that this more generous policy was supported by S. Athanasius. And it was in accordance with this policy that the decrees, which finally received the assent of the council, were shaped.¹

There was one great church, in connexion with which the Alexandrine Fathers foresaw that the application of the decrees of the council might not improbably meet with special difficulty. In the Church of Antioch, as has been explained at length in a previous lecture, the orthodox were themselves divided into two communions. The smaller body, under the leadership of Paulinus, had for sixteen years enjoyed the communion of the Church of Alexandria. The main body of the Antiochene Church, under the episcopal rule of the glorious confessor, S. Meletius, though it had disentangled itself from all communion with the Arians, and was in communion with the Eastern saints, was not in communion with the Church of Alexandria. On the supposition that S. Meletius should be willing to accept the Nicene terminology, there was nothing to hinder intercommunion between him and S. Athanasius on the basis of the decrees of the Alexandrine Council, except perhaps the outstanding difficulty about Marcellus, a difficulty which could surely have been surmounted by the exercise of a little of that wisdom and tact which both saints possessed in an eminent degree. There were, therefore, two pacifications to be carried on at the same time in regard to the Church of Antioch. There was, in the first place, the healing of the breach between the main body of the Antiochene Church and the Church of Alexandria, and there was also the reunion of the Eustathians with the main body of the Antiochene Catholics. It was the necessity for this double pacification which constituted the special difficulty in connexion with Antioch.

The Alexandrine Council determined to send its two illustrious members, S. Eusebius of Vercellae and S. Asterius of Petra, to Antioch, in order that they, in conjunction with the three confessor-bishops, Lucifer of Caralis, Kymatius of Paltus, in Syria Prima, and Anatolius of Euboea, who were

¹ Cf. S. Athan. *Ep. ad Rufinianum*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 768, 769; et Rufin. *H. E.*, i. 28, 29, *P. L.*, xxi. 499; et S. Basil. *Ep. cciv.* § 6, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 306; et S. Hieron. *Dialog. contra Luciferian.*, § 20, *P. L.*, xxiii. 174, 175. The mode of dealing with bishops tainted with the Arian taint, adopted by S. Athanasius and by the Council of Alexandria in 362, agreed with the measures taken by S. Hilary in Gaul six years before (cf. S. Hilar., *contra Constantium Imperat.*, § 2, *P. L.*, x. 578, 579). He seems to have submitted those measures to the exiled confessors for their approval. We have no information as to whether they took any action at the time. If they did take any action in 356 or 357, it must have been individual and not synodical. Now, in 362, the confessors of the communion of S. Athanasius, as a body, ratified S. Hilary's policy in the most solemn manner.

already there,¹ might investigate the state of things on the spot and might take order for the healing of the local breach, so that the whole body of the Antiochene Catholics might acknowledge one bishop, and might be brought into communion with S. Athanasius and with the confessors who communicated with him. Moreover, the council addressed a synodical epistle or "tome" to these five bishops, which informed the three who had not been present at its sessions concerning its decisions, and gave instructions to all the five as to the main lines which should be followed in carrying out the work of pacification. The council directs that its epistle shall be publicly read in the place where the five bishops are wont to hold their meetings for worship. As the Eustathians are described in the document as "they who have ever remained in communion with us,"² it may be reasonably supposed that the council intended that the public reading of the epistle should take place in the Eustathian place of worship. Other persons, who are as yet not in communion with the five bishops, are to be invited to come to their assembly, in order that "there those who desire and strive for peace should be reunited."³ The council, still addressing the bishops, goes on to say that, when the lovers of peace "have been reunited, then in whatever spot is most agreeable to all the laity and in the presence of your Excellencies the public assemblies for worship should be held, and the Lord be glorified by all together." It should be observed that S. Meletius had not yet returned to Antioch from his exile in Armenia.⁴ The programme drawn up at Alexandria presupposed that the Eustathians would have five bishops among them, while the bulk of the Antiochene Catholics would be represented by no bishop. It was therefore not unnatural that S. Athanasius and his brethren should expect the partisans of S. Meletius to come at the outset to the bishops, rather than that the bishops should go out to the church in the old city, where S. Meletius' flock was accustomed to worship. Moreover, some few satisfactions might well be given to the Eustathians in connexion with the preliminary arrangements, because it was obvious that, as soon as reunion was accomplished, the direction of affairs would pass into the hands of the followers of S. Meletius, who were very much

¹ How it came to pass that Kymatius and Anatolius were already in Antioch is not known.

² *Tom. ad Antiochen.* § 4, ap. S. Athan. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 616.

³ The council takes pains to direct that a special invitation shall be sent to "those who meet for worship in the Old City," that is to say, to the followers of S. Meletius.

⁴ Cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, iii. 9, et Sozom. *H. E.*, v. 13.

more numerous than their rivals.¹ As we have seen, S. Meletius' flock was devoted to him, even before his exile; and now that he had confessed the faith so bravely in the presence of the Emperor, and had endured banishment because of his loyalty to the true doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, their enthusiasm for him would know no bounds. Whatever objection might have been formerly raised by S. Athanasius and his followers on the score of S. Meletius having communicated with Arianizers, and of his having been partly elected by Arianizers, had now been got rid of by the decrees of the Alexandrine Council, which had no doubt been drafted with his case very prominently in view.² The action of S. Athanasius and his colleagues had made it certain that the Catholics of Antioch, if they could be brought together into one body, would have S. Meletius for their bishop.³ As the substantial advantages of the Alexandrine arrangement were to be wholly conferred on S. Meletius, his followers might well be asked to allow certain quasi-ceremonial honours to be given to S. Athanasius' old allies, the Eustathians. And it can hardly be doubted that S. Meletius, if he could have been consulted, would have been the first to accede to such an arrangement. He might possibly have insisted that Marcellus should be anathematized before he admitted Paulinus to his communion; ⁴ but he was not the man to haggle over questions

¹ Compare the words of Duchesne on the relative size of the two sections, quoted in note 3 on p. 228.

² Even Stiltinck, speaking of S. Eusebius' view of the situation, after he had come to Antioch, admits (*Acta SS.*, tom. vi. Septembr., p. 620) that "it might seem contrary to the Alexandrine decrees to deprive Meletius of his bishopric, since he was at that time a Catholic." The learned Ultramontane, Pietro Ballerini, declares that, if it had not been for Lucifer's headlong action, all Catholics would have received S. Meletius into communion and would have recognized him as the Bishop of Antioch (cf. Petr. Ballerini., *De vi ac ratione primatus Romanorum pontificum*, Append. i. edit. 1847, pars i. p. 332).

³ See the sentence from Montfaucon quoted on p. 159, n. 1, and the passage from Newman, to which reference is made in the note which immediately follows on the same page. The council, of course, takes care to avoid the mention of S. Meletius' name. It would have been very bad statesmanship if S. Athanasius and his Egyptian colleagues had openly taken the nomination of a bishop for the reunited Church of Antioch into their own hands. The mere fact that they say nothing against the admissibility of S. Meletius, either on the score of doctrine or of canonical status, implies that they were ready to recognize him, when the reunited church at Antioch should have accepted him as its chief pastor.

⁴ No doubt the Fathers of Alexandria had given directions to their representatives not to allow the followers of S. Meletius to impose as a condition of reunion any requirements beyond those that were laid down in the synodical epistle (cf. *Tom. ad Antiochens.* § 4, ap. S. Athan. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 616). But S. Meletius was not bound to accede to those directions. It would be for him to say whether he would receive into his communion any one who declined to anathematize Marcellus, a personage who undoubtedly deserved to be anathematized. If S. Athanasius had broken off all negotiations, on the ground that Marcellus must be defended at all costs, the responsibility for the prolongation of the breach would have rested on him.

of mere precedence, when there was a good hope of reuniting the Church of God.

The tome of the council was signed at Alexandria by S. Eusebius and by S. Asterius, the council's legates, as well as by S. Athanasius, who had presided, and by such other members of the council as had been able to remain until the conclusion of the proceedings.¹ There can be no doubt that it was conveyed to Antioch by the two conciliar legates, or at any rate by S. Eusebius; for, strangely enough, we hear no more of S. Asterius.²

S. Eusebius must have entered Antioch full of hope that a happy reconciliation was going to take place. But he was destined to be grievously disappointed. The fanatical Lucifer, whose short-sighted narrowness stands out in such marked contrast with the generosity and statesmanship of the "royal-hearted" Athanasius, had "taken the improper course of consecrating Paulinus to be bishop for the Eustathians."³ Theodoret assures us that Lucifer's reason for acting in this way was that he saw that the Eustathians spoke in opposition to his proposal that they should come to an agreement with the followers of S. Meletius.⁴ It seems almost incredible that at such a crisis in the history of the Church Lucifer should have taken upon himself to settle irreversibly so grave a matter, when he must have known very well that the line to be taken in regard to Antioch was to be discussed by S. Athanasius and his brethren in the council that was sitting at Alexandria.⁵ His subsequent behaviour shows that he was completely out of sympathy with the wise policy of S. Athanasius and of S. Hilary, and he may have hurried on the

¹ It was signed also by Lucifer's two deacons, and by the two Eustathian deacons, who had been sent by Paulinus.

² Possibly he was taken ill on the voyage, and so was unable to accompany S. Eusebius from the port of landing to Antioch; or he may have died immediately after the conclusion of the council. He appended to the council's letter to the Antiochenes a short sentence expressing his assent to it.

³ Theodoret. *H. E.*, iii. 2. S. Jerome (*Chronic.*, *P. L.*, xxvii. 691, 692) mentions that two confessors co-operated with Lucifer in the consecration. According to some manuscripts, the names of these confessors were Kymatius and Gorgonius.

⁴ The Eustathians no doubt raised the objection that S. Meletius had been ordained by Arians or by bishops who communicated with Arians. There is reason to think (cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, ii. 44) that they also raised the still more fundamental objection that S. Meletius' adherents had been baptized by Arians, as no doubt many of them had. We know from S. Jerome that Lucifer would not have admitted the force of this latter objection (cf. S. Hieron. *Dialog. contr. Luciferian.*, §§ 3 and 20, *P. L.*, xxiii. 157, 175); and the Eustathians themselves, if they were logical, must have given it up after they had received the decrees of the Council of Alexandria. Compare note I on p. 454.

⁵ The criminality of Lucifer's action was increased by the fact that his consecration of Paulinus involved the breach of a promise made previously by him to S. Eusebius. Rufinus (*H. E.*, i. 30) speaks of Lucifer's action as being "contra pollicitationem."

consecration so as to get it done before the legates of the council arrived.¹

S. Eusebius, when, after his arrival, he discovered the hopeless condition into which affairs had been brought, was filled with shame and indignation, and, refusing to communicate either with the followers of S. Meletius or with the Eustathians,² he took his departure for the Cappadocian Caesarea, accompanied by the Antiochene priest, Evagrius, and probably also by the Italian, S. Honoratus, afterwards one of his successors at Vercellac. As for Lucifer, when he saw that S. Eusebius refused to recognize the bishop whom he had consecrated, and when he learnt with disgust what had been decreed by S. Athanasius and his colleagues at Alexandria in favour of the bishops who had become tainted with Arianism, "he broke away from the communion of the Catholic bishops,"³ and retired to his diocese in Sardinia. Cardinal Baronius assures us that he died "absque pace Ecclesiae, in schismate perseverans."⁴

The Council of Alexandria was one of the most important ecclesiastical assemblies that ever met for deliberation and legislation. The master-mind of S. Athanasius may be recognized in its decrees and in its synodical letter. As Newman well says, "All eyes throughout Christendom were . . . turned towards Alexandria, as the Church, which, by its sufferings and its indomitable spirit, had claim to be the arbiter of doctrine, and the guarantee of peace to the Catholic world."⁵

But in the inquiry which we are pursuing, the question

¹ Duchesne (*Églises Séparées*, p. 180) says, "À Antioche on soutenait contre la grande église une petite coterie, pourvue d'un évêque par Lucifer, le fanatique évêque de Cagliari, au mépris de toutes les règles de la prudence et du droit ecclésiastique."

² Cf. Rufin. *H. E.*, i. 30, *P. L.*, xxi. 500.

³ I quote from the *History of the Church*, by the learned Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. Funk (French translation by the Abbé Hemmer, with a preface by Mgr. Duchesne, 1891, p. 216). Hefele (E. tr., ii. 279) makes a similar statement.

⁴ *Annales Ecclesiastici ad ann. 362*, § cxxv., edit. 1654, tom. iv. p. 90. Compare also what Baronius says, *ad ann. 371*, § cxxi., tom. iv. pp. 312-314. The fact that Lucifer fell into schism is acknowledged by all the best historians. It is guaranteed to us by S. Ambrose (*De Excessu Fratris*, i. 47, *P. L.*, xvi. 1362, 1363), Pope Innocent (S. Innocentii, *Ep.* iii. cap. i., *P. L.*, xx. 487), S. Augustine (*Ep.* clxxxv. *ad Bonifacium*, cap. x. § 47, *P. L.*, xxxiii. 813), Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacr.*, ii. 45, *P. L.*, xx. 155), and others. Dr. Rivington, on the other hand, following Stiltinck and some other papalist writers, makes unsuccessful efforts to clear him from the charge, and goes so far as to speak of him as "Saint Lucifer." It is to be feared that Lucifer's claim to be recognized as a saint is even less arguable than that of the "renegade" Liberius, who also appears in Dr. Rivington's book as "Saint Liberius." The questions connected with Lucifer's schism are too remote from my main argument to make it necessary for me to discuss them.

⁵ Newman's *Arians*, edit. 1871, p. 364.

immediately presents itself, What share had Liberius in this great work of pacification? If we are to believe Dr. Rivington, Liberius had the chief share. After mentioning Julian's edict allowing the banished bishops to return to their dioceses, Dr. Rivington goes on to say, "Liberius, ever foremost in the faith, at once entered upon the work of pacification and ecclesiastical discipline. He proceeded to lay down the rules by which the Church should be guided in reconciling those who had in any way compromised themselves by complicity with the manifold forms of Arianism. Antioch was naturally one of his chief cares; and he influenced and authorized the great Bishop of Alexandria to convene a council to consider the position of affairs in that central see of the East. The Council of Alexandria adopted the rules laid down by the sovereign pontiff, and did its best to conciliate the differences that divided the Catholics at Antioch."¹ All this is highly interesting and of the utmost importance, *if it is true*. On the other hand, if it is not true, it is one of the most audacious attempts to substitute romance for history in the interest of an indefensible theological position, that it has ever been my lot to read.

The first point that I notice in regard to the theory accepted by Dr. Rivington, according to which Liberius was the true author of the legislation promulgated by the Council of Alexandria, is that historians, like Tillemont and Hefele, preserve a complete silence about it. It is not that they argue against it, but that they absolutely ignore it. They evidently regard it as being so entirely without foundation, that it is not worth their while to waste time by heaping up proofs of its inadmissibility. Under such circumstances, one would have expected that Dr. Rivington would have made an effort to justify his very dogmatic assertions by some show of argument. All that he does attempt in that way is to refer the reader to three paragraphs in Stiltinck's article on Liberius in the *Acta Sanctorum*.² Not many readers have access to that great collection. Those who have, if they refer to Stiltinck, will find that even he does not profess to regard the theory as historically certain, but only as "very probable." There is nothing in his pages at all resembling the calm assurance which pervades Dr. Rivington's handling of the matter. It is necessary to warn readers, who might otherwise be deceived by Dr. Rivington's tone, that he has neither produced nor even indicated any such evidence as could conceivably justify his attitude of certainty.³

¹ *Prim. Ch.*, pp. 190, 191.

² *Acta SS.*, tom. vi. Septembr., pp. 618, 619.

³ I see that Dr. Rivington, in another note, refers to the interpolation inserted

It is desirable at this point to state that Stiltinck's main argument in favour of what he regards as a "very probable" theory depends upon another theory, which he also regards as "very probable." According to this second theory, Liberius created S. Eusebius and Lucifer his legates to represent him in the East, the one at the Council of Alexandria, and the other at Antioch. Stiltinck is candid enough to tell us that he has nowhere found this supposed legation asserted by any ancient author in clear words.¹ Thus the whole construction is a sort of inverted pyramid, in which theory is piled upon theory, without any substantial basis of fact. It will be well now to test these theories by comparing them with what we really do learn from the ancient writers.²

If it be true that Liberius "authorized" S. Athanasius to convene the Council of Alexandria, and that that council, when it met, "adopted the rules laid down by the sovereign pontiff," how is it that S. Athanasius, when he is promulgating the decisions of the council, never refers to their papal origin?

For example, in the synodical tome addressed by the council to Lucifer and the other bishops at Antioch, which was to be publicly read at a general meeting of the orthodox in that city, the decisions of the Alexandrine Council are fully set forth; but there is not a single word about the Roman pope from the beginning to the end of the document. Neither S. Eusebius nor Lucifer is described as papal legate, nor does the council claim that it had been convened by papal authority, nor is there a word to show that the council's decisions were in accordance with "the rules laid down by the sovereign pontiff." One is compelled to ask once more, Why is there always, in the records of these early councils, such a conspiracy of silence about the papal authority? In the history of no other kingdom do we find the authority of the sovereign so persistently ignored.

But it was not only in the synodical letter to the Antiochenes about the decisions of the Alexandrine Council, that S. Athanasius suppressed all reference to his brother of Rome. He appears to have done the same, when writing a little later on about those same decisions to S. Basil.³ S. Basil refers

into the copy of S. Athanasius' Epistle to Rufinianus, which was used at the second Council of Nicaea in 787. On the spuriousness of this interpolation, see p. 269, n. 1.

¹ See § 197, p. 618. Stiltinck says, "Etiamsi disertis verbis nullibi id assertum ab antiquis reperiam, non minus probabile existimo."

² On the baseless theory which ascribes to S. Eusebius and to Lucifer the status of papal legates, see Additional Note 69, p. 493.

³ Dom Maran, in his *Vit. S. Basil.* (cap. viii. § viii., *Opp. S. Basil.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. pp. lxiv., lxv.), shows that this letter of S. Athanasius to S. Basil was written during the reign of Julian the Apostate—that is to say, soon after the Council of Alexandria, towards the end of 362 or in the early part of 363.

to this letter of S. Athanasius in his 204th epistle. He says, "For having received a letter from the most blessed father Athanasius, the Bishop of Alexandria, which I still keep, and which I show to those who ask to see it, in which letter he clearly declared that, if any one wished to pass over from the Arian heresy, he was without hesitation to be accepted on his confession of the creed of Nicaea; and he moreover informed me concerning those who were associated with him in the acceptance of this decree, namely, all the bishops both of Macedonia and of Achaia; I, considering that it was necessary to follow so great a man on account of the trustworthiness of those who had made the law, and desiring to win the reward promised to peace-makers, began to number all who accepted that creed among those with whom I held communion."¹ Now, I ask—Is it conceivable that S. Basil should refer to the acceptance of the Alexandrine decrees by the bishops of Macedonia and Achaia, and say nothing about their having been drawn up by "the sovereign pontiff," if they had in fact been drawn up by the pope? I certainly do not ascribe to the pope in the fourth century the position which Ultramontanes ascribe to him, but I should admit at once that in that century his deliberate judgement on an important question of general discipline would, under normal circumstances, have more weight in the Church at large than even the unanimous opinion of the bishops of Macedonia and Achaia. The fact that the assent of those bishops is mentioned, and that his assent is not mentioned, is proof positive to me that Liberius had neither drawn up the decrees nor had signified to S. Athanasius his assent to them, at the time when the latter penned his letter to S. Basil.

It is clear from what has been said that when S. Athanasius sent to S. Basil a summary of some of the decrees of the Council of Alexandria, information had reached him concerning the acceptance of those decrees by a synod in Greece. Some time afterwards news arrived at Alexandria of the acceptance of the same decrees by synods in Spain and Gaul. S. Athanasius, writing to the Bishop Rufinianus, says, "Know, most desired Lord, that to begin with, violence having ceased,² a synod has been held [viz. at Alexandria], bishops from foreign parts being present;³ and another synod has been held by our fellow-ministers resident in Greece; and yet others by those in Spain and Gaul; and the same decision was come to here and everywhere, namely,"⁴ etc. Here,

¹ S. Basil. *Ep. cciv. ad Neocaesarienses*, § 6, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 306, 307.

² That is, when the persecuting Emperor Constantius had died.

³ Namely, S. Eusebius from North Italy and S. Asterius from Arabia.

⁴ S. Athan. *Ep. ad Rufinianum*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 768.

again, there is not a word about the decrees having been drawn up by the pope.¹ The presence of foreign bishops at the Council of Alexandria is mentioned, but Rufinianus is not told that a papal legate was one of them. And yet, if a legate of the great primatial see of old Rome had really taken part in the synod, S. Athanasius could hardly have failed to take notice of the fact, since his object in writing to Rufinianus was to urge him to observe the synod's decrees.

At the risk of being tedious, I will confirm the conclusion which has been deduced from the writings of S. Athanasius, by quoting S. Jerome's account of the Council of Alexandria. Of all the Fathers of the fourth century S. Jerome would be the least likely to slur over the share taken by the pope in the great restoration of the faith and of the Church, which took place after the death of Constantius. Yet this is what he

¹ I make this assertion on the basis of the Epistle to Rufinianus, as it is printed in the Benedictine edition and in all the other editions of S. Athanasius' works. It ought, however, to be mentioned that a large part of the Epistle was publicly read at the first session of the second Council of Nicaea, which was held in 787, and that in the extract which was there read, as we find it in the Greek acts of the council (Coleti, viii. 721), an additional clause is inserted near the end of the letter, to the effect that "these things were written in Rome and were received by the Church of the Romans." The fact that there is nothing of this kind in S. Athanasius' tome to the Antiochenes, nor in his letter to S. Basil, nor apparently in any of the extant manuscript copies of his letter to Rufinianus, makes it absolutely certain that the clause is an interpolation. Possibly it may have been originally a marginal note written by some unknown scribe, which afterwards, *per incuriam*, crept into the text. The evidence of an anonymous scribe, who may have written four hundred years after the event, is obviously valueless when confronted with the silence of S. Athanasius himself and of all contemporary historians. There is no trace of the interpolation in such manuscript copies of the letter as I have been able to examine at the Bodleian, namely, Barocc. xci. (fol. 5 a), Barocc. clviii. (fol. 201 b), Barocc. clxxxv. (fol. 161 a), Barocc. cxcvi. (fol. 225 b), Barocc. ccv. (fol. 400 a), and Meerm. Auctar. T. ii. 6 (fol. 220 a). The last manuscript is also catalogued as Cod. Miscell. ccvi. The Benedictine editors, in a note (*Opp.* S. Athan., i. 769), refer to the interpolation as found in the acts of the second Nicene Council. If they had known of any manuscripts containing the interpolation, they would certainly have mentioned them. Of course, the Benedictines exclude the interpolation from their text. On the other hand, Dr. Rivington, without giving any hint to the reader that the interpolation is absent from the manuscript copies of the letter and from the printed editions of S. Athanasius' Works, cites the interpolation in defence of his audacious statements (see *Prim. Church*, p. 191, n. 1). It is worth mentioning that, according to the ancient Latin version of the acts of the second Council of Nicaea (Coleti, viii. 1330), the interpolated clause should read as follows: "These things were written to Rome, and were received by the Church of the Romans." This reading gives a much better sense, and states what is no doubt the truth. Probably this reading represents the clause, as it was originally written by the scribe who first composed it. But its absence from the manuscript copies of the letter, and its awkward position, leave no doubt that it is an interpolation. Since writing the above, I have heard from Mr. Alfred Rogers, of the University Library at Cambridge, to whom my warm thanks are due, that the interpolation is absent from the only manuscript copy of the letter to Rufinianus which is in the Cambridge library, namely, Ee. 4. 29 (fol. 341 a). I have also ascertained by personal inspection that it is absent from the only two manuscript copies of the letter which I could discover in the library of the British Museum, namely, Additional 34060 (fol. 289 b) and Ar. 533 (fol. 347 a).

says: "On the return of the confessors it was determined, in a synod afterwards held at Alexandria, that with the exception of the authors of the heresy, who could not be excused on the ground of having made a mistake, those who repented should be admitted to communion with the Church: not that those, who had been heretics, could be bishops; but because it was clear that those, who were received, had not been heretics. *The West assented to this decision*; and it was by means of this most necessary decree that the world was snatched from the jaws of Satan."¹ Here the whole merit of initiating the salutary policy, which the Church adopted, is ascribed to the Council of Alexandria. All that the West did was to assent to what S. Athanasius and his fellow-confessors had determined.²

From what has been said it seems to result that, after the death of Constantius, the great work of extricating the Church from the miserable condition, into which she had lapsed, was not initiated by Pope Liberius of Rome, but rather by Pope S. Athanasius of Alexandria. Now, this fact is very noteworthy. Under ordinary circumstances one would expect the bishop of the first see rather than the bishop of the second to take the lead in a matter of this kind; and one cannot help asking the question—Why did not Liberius come to the front in the year 362? I have already suggested the answer.³ Liberius' own fall precluded him from taking the first steps in the work of rehabilitating his fallen brethren. The fact was that, before he could intervene with effect, he needed to be rehabilitated himself. Unfortunately, we have no certain knowledge about the details connected with his rehabilitation. Letters no doubt between Rome and Alexandria, but they have not been preserved, or at any rate they have not as yet been discovered. In 357 Liberius had withdrawn from the communion of S. Athanasius, and in May or June, 358, he had made matters worse by signing a

¹ S. Hieron. *Dialog. adversus Luciferianos*, § 20, *P. L.*, xxiii. 174, 175. A still stronger argument might, perhaps, be derived from a passage in S. Jerome's 15th Epistle, which was addressed to Pope Damasus (*Ep.* xv. § 3, *P. L.*, xxii. 356). He begins a sentence thus: "Nunc igitur proh dolor! post Nicaenam fidem, post Alexandrinum juncto pariter Occidente decretum." Here, in a letter addressed to the pope, not a word is said about the papal origin of the Alexandrine decrees. The assent of the West is evidently posterior and secondary.

² I have already pointed out (see p. 261, n. 1) that S. Hilary had anticipated the Alexandrine policy six years before the Council of Alexandria. But S. Hilary's action was confined to Gaul. It was local. Whereas S. Athanasius and his band of confessors set forth a line of action which was intended to be ecumenical in its application, and was in fact accepted by the whole Church. Rufinus (*H. E.*, i. 29, *P. L.*, xxi. 499) tells us that the council appointed S. Asterius to superintend the execution of its decrees in the East, and that it committed to S. Eusebius a similar function in the West.

³ See p. 259.

repudiation of the ὁμοούσιον, and by communicating with Ursacius and Valens.¹ In August, 358, took place that triumphal entry of his into Rome, which had been so shamefully purchased. From that time onward until the death of Constantius, and one may add until the year 363, very little is known of the history of the Roman Church.² There appear to have been serious contests between the partisans of Liberius and those of his rival, Felix II. Duchesne says, "Sozomen testifies that on the return of Liberius disorders broke out. . . . The existence of these disorders is corroborated indirectly by the fact that in the following year, 359, the Roman Church was represented at the Council of Ariminum neither by Liberius nor by Felix nor by any legate. Such a complete abstention points most clearly to a very disturbed state of things at Rome."³ After the conclusion of the Council of Ariminum, almost all the Western bishops signed the heterodox formula, which the council had sanctioned. It must be mentioned to the credit of Liberius that he did not sign.⁴ As a rule, those who refused to sign were banished. How Liberius escaped banishment is not clear. Certain *Gesta Liberii* of very small historical value⁵ assert that he hid himself in the catacombs until the death of Constantius.⁶ It is just possible that these *Gesta* preserve in this case a true tradition.

It would seem that in 362, when the Council of Alexandria met, Liberius was still out of communion with S. Athanasius. Reference has already been made to the fact that the council, in its tome to the Antiochenes, made no allusion to the Roman pope;⁷ and the same silence about that personage was observed, as we have seen,⁸ by S. Athanasius in his letters to S. Basil and to Rufinianus.⁹ Moreover, the council appointed S. Eusebius of Vercellae to superintend

¹ In Appendix G, on Sozomen's account of Liberius' fall (pp. 275-287), I have discussed the details and stages of that sad transaction. The reader is specially referred to pp. 279-281, and to p. 283, note 2.

² See the observations of Duchesne, in his edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* (tom. i. p. 209).

³ *Lib. Pont.*, edit. Duchesne, *u.s.*

⁴ Vincent of Capua, who had fallen at the Council of Arles in 353, shared with Liberius the honour of refusing to sign the formula of Ariminum. Liberius, however, though he might have done worse, cannot be excused from blame. He ought to have protested against the decrees of Ariminum at once, and, so far as in him lay, rescinded them. There is good reason for thinking that he did not take this bold line, so long as Constantius lived, nor indeed until after the Council of Alexandria in 362 (see pp. 272-274).

⁵ Migne has printed them (*P. L.*, viii. 1387-1395). They belong to a group of apocryphal acts, which were concocted at Rome, in the interest of Pope Symmachus, about the year 501 (see *Lib. Pont.*, edit. Duchesne, *Introd.*, pp. cxxii. and cxxxiii.).

⁶ Cf. Baron. *Annal.*, ad ann. 359, § 48.

⁷ See p. 267.

⁸ See pp. 267, 268.

⁹ See p. 269.

the execution of its decrees in the West—a fact which, taken in connexion with its silence about Liberius, points very significantly to the conclusion that the Fathers of the council did not recognize the Roman bishop as being in communion with themselves.

We may, perhaps, be justified in supposing that some expression of penitence for the past, together with some clear confession of the *ὁμοούσιον* and some explicit condemnation of all Arians, was sent by Liberius to S. Athanasius soon after the conclusion of the Council of Alexandria. Athanasius would no doubt gladly welcome any such advance, and in accordance with the decrees of the council about the treatment of fallen bishops, he would feel no difficulty in recognizing the penitent Liberius as the canonical occupant of the Roman see. During the course of the following year S. Athanasius, in a letter to Jovian, mentions that he had received letters from the churches of Spain and Britain and the Gauls, and from those of “all Italy” and of Dalmatia and of other provinces of both East and West; and he assures the Emperor that all these churches have expressed their assent to the faith of Nicaea.¹ Assuredly S. Athanasius would never have said that he had received letters from the churches of “all Italy” unless he had received a communication from the Church of Rome. Unfortunately, the whole of this large correspondence has perished. We have neither the letters from the churches nor S. Athanasius’ replies.

When good relations had been re-established between the churches of Alexandria and Rome, S. Athanasius must have sent the decrees of the Alexandrine Council to Liberius; and some months later the pope received also a report of the confirmation of those decrees by the episcopate of Greece. It was after the receipt of the communication from Greece that Liberius wrote the letter to the Catholic bishops of Italy, which S. Hilary has preserved for us in his twelfth Fragment.² In that letter Liberius defends the generous policy which had been adopted by the Council of Alexandria,

¹ Cf. S. Athan. *Ep. ad Jovianum*, § 2, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1777, i. 623.

² Cf. S. Hilar. *Fragm.* xii., *P. L.*, x. 714-716. In this letter Liberius refers explicitly to the Greek synod as well as to the Council of Alexandria. He says nothing about the previous adoption of the Alexandrine policy by S. Hilary in Gaul. Probably he knew nothing about it officially. One may feel fairly certain that there was no communion between S. Hilary and Liberius during the interval which elapsed between the latter’s fall in 357 and his reconciliation with S. Athanasius in the winter of 362-363. It was after the death of Constantius, in November, 361, that S. Hilary published his *Liber contra Constantium*, in which, apostrophizing Constantius on the subject of his treatment of Liberius, he says (cap. xi., *P. L.*, x. 589), “O miserable man, in regard to whom I know not whether you committed the greater act of impiety, when you banished him [Liberius], or when you sent him back again [to Rome].”

and which was being attacked by the narrow-minded Lucifer and his adherents; and he refers to a previous letter of his, in which the Alexandrine decrees had been fortified by the authority of his apostolic see. Here, again, it is unfortunate that that previous letter has not been hitherto discovered. S. Hilary, in the same twelfth Fragment, preserves a letter addressed by the bishops of Italy to the orthodox bishops throughout Illyricum.¹ This letter contains a formal abrogation of the decrees of the Council of Ariminum. The Italian bishops say, "With the consent of all the provinces, we justly rescind the decrees of the Council of Ariminum, which were corrupted through the shuffling conduct of certain persons."² They go on to inform the Illyrian bishops that, if any bishop wishes to hold communion with the bishops of Italy, he must send to them unambiguously worded documents containing the applicant's subscription to the Nicene Creed, and his abrogation of the Council of Ariminum. It seems, therefore, that in 363³ there was a general abrogation of the Council of Ariminum by the Western bishops; for what was exacted from the bishops of Illyricum was doubtless also exacted from the bishops in other regions of the West. Pope Siricius, in his letter to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona in Spain, records the fact that "after the abrogation of the Council of Ariminum," "general decrees" against rebaptizing Arians were "sent to the provinces by Liberius, my predecessor of venerable memory."⁴ The promulgation of these general decrees against rebaptizing Arians may be probably assigned to the year 364, or else to 365.⁵ That promulgation, and

¹ Tillemont (vii. 459) gives reasons for supposing that the letter of the Italian bishops to the Illyrians was written in reply to a letter from the bishops of Illyricum to the Italians. The Illyrian letter may very probably have been written by the council of Greek and Macedonian bishops, at which the decrees of Alexandria were confirmed. Macedonia and Greece formed part of Eastern Illyricum. It seems to me to be also probable that both the Greek and the Italian councils acted under the guidance of S. Eusebius of Vercellae.

² S. Hilar. *Fragm.* xii., § 3, *P. L.*, x. 716: "Ariminensis concilii statuta quorundam tergiversatione corrupta, consensu omnium provinciarum, jure rescindimus." The context makes it clear that "the provinces" here mentioned are the provinces of Italy.

³ It was in the early part of 363 that S. Hilary and S. Eusebius of Vercellae were labouring in Italy for the overthrow of Arianism. Before the end of 363 S. Athanasius was able to assure the Emperor Jovian that he had received letters from the churches planted in Eastern Illyricum and in part of Western Illyricum, informing him that they assented to the creed of Nicaea.

⁴ Siricii *Ep.* i. *ad Himerium*, cap. i., *P. L.*, xiii. 1133. The "provinces" would, I imagine, be in this case also the provinces of Italy (compare note 2 above).

⁵ S. Jerome (*Dial. adv. Lucif.*, § 21, *P. L.*, xxiii. 175) lets us know that the more extreme Luciferians, under the leadership of Hilary the deacon, refused to recognize the validity of Arian baptism. It was probably the rise of this party which gave occasion to the decrees promulgated by Liberius. Lucifer broke away from the Church in the latter part of the year 362; and Hilary may have separated from Lucifer in 363 or 364.

also the abrogation of the Council of Ariminum, which preceded it, were in any case subsequent to the Council of Alexandria.

My readers will, I hope, consider that good reasons have been given for believing that it was S. Athanasius and not Liberius, who took the initiative and had the main share in the work of restoring the Church after it had been thrown into confusion during the disastrous reign of Constantius.¹ I trust also that I have succeeded in explaining in some measure how it came to pass that the Church, during this terrible crisis, looked for guidance rather to Alexandria than to Rome. The whole history makes it clear that the leadership of Rome is not a vital element in the constitution of the Church. During certain periods, and under certain circumstances, that leadership was the natural outcome of the situation. But there is no divine guarantee that Rome will be always faithful. If she withdraws her communion from this or that portion of the Church, it does not follow that she is to be regarded as being necessarily in the right. Our Lord will find means of restoring His Church through other champions, if the bishop of the first see fails. The Roman primacy is not a matter of divine institution, but of ecclesiastical appointment and recognition. When Liberius and the great mass of bishops had succumbed, it became all the more needful that S. Athanasius should stand up alone, or almost alone, against the world. The truth involved in the adage, *Athanasius contra mundum*, is one which the Church needs to cherish in every age, and not least in our own; and she will do well to remember that the *mundus* sometimes includes the Bishop of Rome.

¹ Duchesne, in an article entitled *L'Église d'Orient de Dioclétien à Mahomet* (*Revue du Monde Catholique*, tom. lxiv. p. 539), speaking of the great recovery from Arianism which took place in 362 and the years which followed, sums up the situation very fairly. He says, "Athanasie siège un moment à Alexandrie entre deux exils; il fixe les conditions de la paix qu'il faut bien accorder à tant de faillis. Eusèbe de Verceil, Hilaire de Poitiers, Libère lui-même, diminué dans son prestige personnel, mais non dans l'autorité de son siège, travaillent avec succès à la réhabilitation de l'Occident."

APPENDIX G.

On Sozomen's account of Liberius' fall (see pp. 259 and 271).

I WISH in this Appendix to investigate the statements made by Sozomen¹ in regard to the proceedings of Liberius, when he was at Sirmium in the year 358. I specially wish to consider the question whether on that occasion Liberius definitely repudiated the *ὁμοούσιον*. I will begin by quoting so much of the chapter in Sozomen's *History* as will enable the reader to follow the course of my argument.

Sozomen says,² "Not long afterwards, the Emperor having returned from Rome to Sirmium, and the Western bishops having sent an embassy to him, he summons Liberius from Beroea. And the legates from the East being present, he assembled the bishops, who happened to be staying at his court, and set to work to press Liberius to confess that the Son is not consubstantial (*ὁμοούσιον*) with the Father. Basil and Eustathius and Eleusius were urgent, and moved the Emperor to do this, using very great freedom of speech with him. They proceeded at that very time to gather together into one document the things which had been decreed against Paul of Samosata and against Photinus of Sirmium, and also the creed which was set forth at the dedication of the church in Antioch, because, as they said, certain persons, under pretext of the *ὁμοούσιον*, were undertaking to frame privately a heresy, and they contrive that Liberius, and also Athanasius and Alexander and Severianus and Crescens, who were bishops in Africa, should consent to this formula. In like manner, consent was given to it by Ursacius and by Germinius of Sirmium and by Valens Bishop of Mursa, and by as many Eastern bishops as were

¹ *H. E.*, iv. 15.

² Οὐ πολλῶ δὲ ὕστερον ἐπανελλθὼν ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης εἰς Σίρμιον ὁ βασιλεὺς, πρεσβευσαμένων τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως ἐπισκόπων, μετακαλεῖται Λιβέριον ἐκ Βεροίας. Παρόντων τε τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑὸς πρέσβειων, συναγαγὼν τοὺς παρατυχόντας ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἱερέας, ἐβιάζετο αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν μὴ εἶναι τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν ὁμοούσιον. Ἐνέκειντο δὲ, καὶ τὸν κρατοῦντα ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐκίνουν, πλείστην παρ' αὐτῷ παῖρῃσιαν ἄγοντες, Βασίλειος καὶ Εὐστάθιος καὶ Ἐλεῦσιος. Οἱ δὴ τότε εἰς μίαν γραφὴν ἀθροίσαντες τὰ δεδογμένα ἐπὶ Παύλῳ τῷ ἐκ Σαμοσάτων, καὶ Φωτεινῷ τῷ ἐκ Σιρμίου, καὶ τὴν ἐκτεθεῖσαν πλίστη ἐν τοῖς ἐγκαινίοις τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἐκκλησίας, ὡς ἐπὶ προφάσει τοῦ ὁμοουσίου ἐπιχειροῦντων τινῶν ἰδίᾳ συνιστᾶν αἵρεσιν, παρασκευάζουσι συναυέσαι ταύτῃ Λιβέριον, Ἀθανάσιον τε καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, καὶ Σεβηριανὸν καὶ Κρίσκεντα, οἱ ἐν Ἀφρικῇ ἱέρωντο. Ὁμοίως δὲ συνήρουν καὶ Οὐρσάκιος καὶ Γερμάνιος ὁ Σιρμίου, καὶ Οὐάλης ὁ Μουρσῶν ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ὅσοι ἐκ τῆς ἑὸς παρῆσαν. Ἐν μέρει δὲ καὶ ὁμολογίαν ἐκομίσαντο παρὰ Λιβέριου, ἀποκηρύττουσαν τοὺς μὴ κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν ἀποφαίνοντας. Ἦνίκα γὰρ τὴν Ὅσιον ἐπιστολὴν ἐδέξαντο Εὐδόξιος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ Ἀετίου αἵρεσει σπουδάζοντες, ἐλογοποιοῦν ὡς καὶ Λιβέριος τὸ ὁμοούσιον ἀπεδοκίμασε, καὶ ἀνόμοιον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν δοξάζει. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα ὤδε κατάρθρωτο τοῖς ἐκ τῆς δύσεως πρέσβειν, ἀπέδωκεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Λιβερῖῳ τὴν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃ ἐπάνοδον γράφουσί τε προσδέξασθαι αὐτὸν οἱ ἐν Σιρμίῳ ἐπίσκοποι, Φίληκι τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τότε τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῷ ἐνθάδε κλήρῳ ἕμφω δὲ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν ἐπιτροπεύειν θρόνον, καὶ κοινῇ ἱερᾶσθαι μεθ' ὁμονοίας, ἀμνηστία τε παραδοῦναι τὰ συμβάντα ἀνιὰρὰ διὰ τὴν Φίληκος χειροτονίαν, καὶ τὴν Λιβερῖου ἀποδημίαν.—Sozom. *H. E.*, iv. 15, edit. Hussey, i. 355-357.

present. But they also received in turn from Liberius a confession which excommunicated those who should declare that the Son is not similar to the Father in essence and in all respects. For, when Eudoxius and his partisans at Antioch, who zealously favoured the heresy of Aetius, received the letter of Hosius, they began to spread abroad the rumour that Liberius also had rejected the *ὁμοούσιον*, and that he holds the opinion that the Son is unlike (*ἀνόμοιον*) the Father. But when these things had been in this way accomplished by the representatives of the West, the Emperor allowed Liberius to return to Rome. And the bishops, who were at Sirmium, write to Felix, who was at that time governing the Church of the Romans, and to the clergy of Rome, telling them that they should receive Liberius, and directing that both bishops should act as administrators of the apostolic see, and that they should exercise in common the episcopal office in a spirit of concord, and that all the distressing things, which had happened by reason of the ordination of Felix and of the exile of Liberius, should be buried in oblivion."

I have already referred to the fact¹ that in Duchesne's opinion this chapter of Sozomen's *History* is based on what the learned writer describes as "documents officiels et de première main." It may be worth while, before going on to consider the substance of Sozomen's statement about Liberius' proceedings at Sirmium, to call attention to some facts which in my opinion go far to corroborate Duchesne's view of the trustworthiness of the documents on which this particular chapter of Sozomen's *History* is founded.

It will have been noticed that, according to Sozomen's account, one of the three formularies which made up the composite document accepted by Liberius at Sirmium, consisted of "the things which had been decreed against Paul of Samosata." The reference is no doubt to the decrees against that heretic, promulgated by the Antiochene Council of 268, which deposed him. Now, there is no trace of these decrees against Paul of Samosata having been used in controversy during the whole course of the Arian dispute, prior to this very year, 358,² in which they were submitted to Liberius for his acceptance. To readers of Sozomen's *History* they present themselves, in the chapter which we are considering, as a new and startling apparition. We are inclined to ask—How did it come to pass that these three bishops, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and Eleusius of Cyzicus, who, as Sozomen tells us in a previous chapter,³ had been sent as legates to Constantius from the Council of Ancyra,—how, we ask, did it come to pass that they should think of proposing for Liberius' acceptance these somewhat ancient Antiochene decrees? Sozomen supplies us with no answer to this question; but S. Hilary and S. Athanasius do.⁴ We learn from them that that very Council of

¹ See p. 259.

² See Dom Maran's *Dissertation sur les Semi-Ariens* (*Bibliothec. Hist. Haeresiolog.*, edit. J. Vogt, Hamburg, 1729, ii. 155-162); and Father De Smedt's *Dissertationes Selectae*, p. 295; and Cardinal Franzelin's *Tractat. de Deo Trino*, pp. 191, 192.

³ *H. E.*, iv. 13; cf. S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, § 90, *P. L.*, x. 542.

⁴ S. Hilary (*De Synodis*, § 81, *P. L.*, x. 534) summarizes an epistle, almost certainly emanating from the Council of Ancyra, or at any rate from its leaders

Ancyra, which had sent Basil, Eustathius, and Eleusius to Sirmium, had been laying considerable stress on the decrees against Paul of Samosata in its synodical epistles. The Council of Ancyra had been held about two months before the meeting at Sirmium; and it was precisely at the Council of Ancyra that the Antiochene decrees of 268 were first quoted during the Arian controversy, as having an important bearing on some of the questions at issue.¹ It seems to me that we have here an undesignated coincidence, and that the trustworthiness of the sources of this chapter of Sozomen's *History* is very strongly confirmed by its fitting in so well with the information supplied by S. Hilary and S. Athanasius,² who as historical authorities rank in the first class.

I now pass on to another argument corroborating the truth of Sozomen's account of what took place at the episcopal meeting at Sirmium in May or June, 358. The reader will have observed that Sozomen mentions the presence of four African bishops at that meeting. Dr. Gwatkin suggests that they were confessors.³ I presume that he means banished confessors, living at that time away from Africa. It would rather seem to me that the expressions used by Sozomen are calculated to make one think that the four bishops had been sent as legates to Constantius by the African Church;⁴ and if so, they must have come from Africa, and, when their embassy was concluded, would naturally return to Africa. Now, the interposition of African bishops in the disputes arising out of the Arian controversy is so rare an event, that one is almost necessarily led to ask the question—Is there any other and legates, in which an important argument is based on the decrees against Paul of Samosata; and S. Athanasius refers (S. Athan., *De Synodis*, § 43) to a document quite certainly emanating from that council, and he makes it clear that in the document to which he refers, a similar argument, based on the Antiochene decrees, is used. It is possible, though not certain, that S. Hilary and S. Athanasius are dealing with the same synodical epistle.

¹ For the causes of the decrees against Paul of Samosata having been kept in the background during the first forty years of the Arian controversy, and of their suddenly coming into prominence at the Council of Ancyra, see De Smedt (*Dissertationes Selectae*, p. 295).

² The fact that the Antiochene decrees of 268 were just at this particular period prominently before the minds of the Semi-Arian group, of which Basil of Ancyra was the centre, has testimony borne to it by another document, belonging either to the year 358 or to the year 359, which was signed by Basil of Ancyra, George of Laodicea, and some other bishops. In this document also reference is made to the decrees against Paul of Samosata. It is preserved for us by S. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxxiii. 12-23, *P. G.*, xlii. 425-441). It seems to have been only during the two years 358 and 359 that George of Laodicea was in alliance with the Semi-Arians. This point fixes the date of the document to which reference is made in this note. Dr. Gwatkin (*Studies of Arianism*, p. 168) evidently supposes that it was drawn up at Sirmium in May, 359.

³ *Studies of Arianism*, p. 159, n. 1.

⁴ Sozomen speaks of "the Western bishops having sent an embassy" to Constantius; and the Western ambassadors evidently took part in the Sirmian meeting. But the only Western bishops who seem to have been present at that meeting were Liberius, Valens, Ursacius, Germinius, and the four African bishops. Of these the first four were not ambassadors. It seems, therefore, necessary that we should identify the ambassadors with the African bishops. They were doubtless sent, not by the whole West, but by the African Church; just as those whom Sozomen describes as "the legates from the East," were sent, not by the whole East, but by the small Council of Ancyra, which consisted only of bishops from Asia Minor.

evidence of communications concerning dogmatic questions passing at this time between the Emperor and his episcopal counsellors on the one side, and the African Church on the other side? It is clear that, if such evidence could be produced, it would tend to show that Sozomen was exceedingly well informed in regard to the details of what went on at the Sirmian meeting. And it seems to me that evidence of such intercourse with Africa is forthcoming. There is a remarkable passage in the treatise of Marius Victorinus *adversus Arium*,¹ in which he apostrophizes some bishop, whom he describes as the "patron of the dogma" of the *ἁμοιούσιον*.² In the course of his expostulation with this bishop, Victorinus speaks of him as saying, concerning the *ἁμοιούσιον*, "It is in this way that the Africans and all the Orientals understand the matter." Victorinus, still addressing the bishop, retorts, "Why, then, do you write to them, requiring them to cast out the *ἁμοιούσιον* from the holy Church? They, having received your letter, declare that such a letter ought not to have been written to them; and that, if a letter was to be written, the effort to persuade them should have been based on an appeal to reason and Scripture, and not on the mere intimation of a command (*non solum jussione*); for it was your duty not only to pull down the *ἁμοιούσιον* but to build up the *ἁμοιούσιον*." It would seem that the letter to the African Church from the unnamed bishop was backed up by the authority of the Emperor. Under the circumstances existing in the Church during the only period when a letter of command in favour of the *ἁμοιούσιον* was likely to be sent to the African Church, some exercise of the imperial authority would be needed to give effective force to the *jussio*. In point of fact, it appears to me to be highly probable that this letter of the unnamed bishop was written from Sirmium in 358;³ for it was only during that year and perhaps the first few months of the following year, that the maintainers of the *ἁμοιούσιον* had influence enough with the Emperor to be in a position to induce him to support their measures by the backing of his authority; and the fact that the four African legates at Sirmium had signed the composite formulary may have suggested the dispatch of a letter to the whole African Church, to be conveyed by the legates, and to be delivered by them on their return to Africa. If the letter to the Africans was written then, it would almost certainly have been written by Basil of Ancyra, who was by far the most influential bishop at Sirmium. I therefore am inclined to identify the unnamed bishop, apostrophized by Victorinus, with Basil of Ancyra. He, more

¹ Lib. i. capp. xxviii., xxix., *P. L.*, viii. 1061. This treatise seems to have been written during the reign of Constantius (cf. lib. ii. cap. ix., *P. L.*, viii. 1096), and therefore before November, 361.

² The scribes, who copied Victorinus' treatise, have made sad confusion with the Greek words which he uses. Throughout Migne's edition of this treatise no distinction is made between *ἁμοιούσιον* and *ἁμοιούσιον*, but the context generally makes clear in each case which of the two expressions was in fact used in that place by Victorinus.

³ S. Hilary (*Lib. contr. Constantium Imp.*, § 26, *P. L.*, x. 601) refers to a communication from Constantius to the African Church, apparently sent in 360; but it was evidently prompted, not by the Semi-Arians, but by the Acacians, and it therefore has no direct connexion with the letter mentioned by Victorinus. On the intervention of Constantius in the affairs of the African Church in 360, see Merenda's *Diatriba de Gestis Liberii Exsulis*, § vii., *P. L.*, xiii. 305, 306.

than anybody else, had a right to be called the "patron of the dogma" of the *ὁμοιόσιον*; and there are other touches in the passage from Victorinus which might be quoted, if it were worth while, in corroboration of this identification.¹ Moreover, in the ninth and tenth chapters of the second book of his treatise *adversus Arium*,² Victorinus expressly names Basil as the champion of the *ὁμοιόσιον*, and apostrophizes him in the words, "Tu Basili." The whole of this argument is clinched by the fact that the Acacians at the Council of Constantinople in 360 seem to have put forward this very letter to the Africans as a reason for deposing Basil. Sozomen, in a later chapter,³ says, "They [the Acacians at Constantinople] added that he [Basil] had stirred up the clergy in Sirmium against [their bishop] Germinius, and that, though Basil communicated with Germinius and Valens and Ursacius, yet that he calumniated them to the bishops of Africa in a letter . . . moreover, that he had been a cause of discord and tumult to the Illyrians and Italians and Africans, and that he was the author of the things that had happened in regard to the Church of the Romans."⁴ Thus it appears that Sozomen's mention of the part which the four African bishops played at the Sirmian meeting fits in admirably with the information which we gather from Victorinus about Basil's letter to the Africans, and with the charges brought against Basil by the Acacians at Constantinople in 360.

On the whole, when I review what has been written in this first section of this Appendix, it appears to me that two different lines of reasoning have resulted in a strong confirmation of Sozomen's trustworthiness⁵ in what he says about the proceedings of the meeting held at Sirmium in May or June, 358. In all probability he had access to the official acts of that meeting.

Let us now go on to consider what it was that, according to Sozomen, Liberius did when he was present at this Sirmian meeting. Sozomen assures us that, when the bishops were assembled, the Emperor set to work to press Liberius to confess that the Son is not consubstantial (*ὁμοούσιον*) with the Father. He also tells us that the Emperor was moved to act in this way by the three Semi-Arian legates from the Council of

¹ Note that Victorinus suggests that "perhaps" the unnamed bishop was not only alive at the time of the Council of Nicaea, but that he was already a bishop at that time. This implies that he must at any rate have passed many years in the episcopate. In fact, Basil counted twenty-two years of episcopate at the date of the Sirmian meeting of 358. Later on, Victorinus speaks of the unnamed bishop describing the heresies of Paul of Samosata, Marcellus, Photinus, and finally those of Valens and Ursacius. These are exactly the heresiarchs to which Basil would be sure to call attention in 358. The final reference would be to the "blasphemy" of 357 (compare Hefele, E. tr., ii. 227; and see S. Hil. *Lib. contra Constantium Imperat.*, § 26, P. L., x. 601).

² P. L., viii. 1095, 1096.

³ H. E., iv. 24.

⁴ Obviously the reference is to the struggle which took place between the adherents of Liberius and the adherents of Felix, after the return of the former to Rome in August, 358. That return of Liberius was mainly due to Basil.

⁵ The Ultramontane Merenda, in his *Diatriba de Gestis Liberii Exsulis*, § vi. (P. L., xiii. 298), speaking of Sozomen's account of the Sirmian meeting, says, "Unus itaque Sozomenus superest, qui gestae tunc rei memoriam transmisit ad posterios, atque illam adeo descriptam accurate, ut omnem omnino pudorem exuisse oporteat, qui ejus hoc in facto auctoritatem sequi nolit."

Ancyra ; and he informs us that these legates "proceeded at that very time to gather together into one document the things which had been decreed against Paul of Samosata and against Photinus of Sirmium, and also the creed which was set forth at the dedication of the church in Antioch, because, as they said, certain persons, under pretext of the *ἡμοούσιον*, were undertaking to frame privately a heresy."¹ It surely must be admitted by all candid persons that the *prima facie* meaning of these statements of Sozomen is that the three legates from Ancyra had the practical management of affairs in their hands, and that their great object was to induce Liberius not merely to pass over the *ἡμοούσιον* in silence, though that in him would be bad enough, but "to confess that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father." They moved the Emperor to press Liberius to do this, and they drew up a composite formulary, which was evidently so constructed as to commit any one, who signed it, to a repudiation of the *ἡμοούσιον*. They justified their proceeding by the assertion that "certain persons, under pretext of the *ἡμοούσιον*, were undertaking to frame privately a heresy."

Let us now consider more particularly the constituent parts of the composite formulary, which, as we have seen, must have contained some clause or clauses repudiating the *ἡμοούσιον*. There seems to be no doubt that by the expression—"the creed which was set forth at the dedication of the church in Antioch"—Sozomen means us to understand the Lucianic creed,² which was the second of the four creeds commonly attributed to the Council of the Dedication.³ There seems also to be no doubt that, when Sozomen speaks of the decrees "against Photinus of Sirmium," he is alluding to the creed of the Council of Sirmium of the year 351, with its appended anathemas.⁴ The council of 351 was assembled against Photinus of Sirmium, and actually deposed him, and its anathemas deal largely with his heresy. It is to be noted that neither in the creed nor in the anathemas of the Sirmian Council of 351 is there any allusion to the heresy of Paul of Samosata,⁵ and that neither in the decrees of Sirmium nor in the Lucianic creed is there any express repudiation of the *ἡμοούσιον*. The place of honour in the composite formulary signed by Liberius was assigned to "the things which had been decreed against Paul of Samosata." To me it seems perfectly clear that what is intended by this phrase is the decree put forth against Paul of Samosata by the Council of Antioch of the year 268.⁶ Basil of Ancyra

¹ They, perhaps, had in view S. Athanasius and other orthodox maintainers of the Nicene formula ; but, no doubt, they principally aimed at Marcellus of Ancyra, Basil's hated rival.

² See Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, p. 118, n. 4, and p. 119, n. 2, and p. 162, n. 2 ; see also Newman's translation of *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius*, p. 106, n. b, and Robertson's *Prolegomena*, p. xlv.

³ The Lucianic creed may be read in Hefele (E. tr., ii. 77, 78).

⁴ The Sirmian creed of 351, which is identical with the fourth Antiochene formula, and with the creed of Philippopolis, may be read in Hefele (E. tr., ii. 80, 81) ; and the appended anathemas may also be read in Hefele (ii. 194-198).

⁵ Yet Sozomen (*H. E.*, iv. 6) says that Photinus was deposed by the Sirmian Council of 351, "because he was accused of accepting the errors of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata."

⁶ Petavius (*De Trin.*, lib. i. cap. ix. § 5, *Dogm. Theol.*, edit. 1865, ii. 333) and

and his Semi-Arian colleagues were, as we have seen,¹ very full of that decree in the spring of the year 358. The reason why they rejoiced in it was because it contained an express repudiation of the term *δμοούσιον*,² which they dreaded as Sabellian. Having been drawn up by the Catholic Fathers, who had deposed the Samosatene heretic, it was just the formula to present to Liberius for signature,³ and so secure his rejection of the *δμοούσιον*. Liberius, of course, ought to have answered that a great deal had happened since 268, and that he could not sign a repudiation of the *δμοούσιον* understood in the Samosatene sense, without at the same time declaring his adherence to that same formula when understood in the Nicene sense. But Liberius knew well that, if he confessed his adherence to the *δμοούσιον* in any sense, he had no chance of going back to Rome. He therefore signed and fell.⁴ He entered into communion with the Arians, Valens and Ursacius and Germinius, and with the Semi-Arians, Basil and Eustathius and Eleusius, on the basis of an explicit repudiation of the *δμοούσιον*.⁵ To use Cardinal Newman's words, "The pope" became "a renegade."⁶

Before bringing this Appendix to an end, it will be perhaps well to consider some of the objections that have been urged against the conclusion which has been reached.

Newman (*Arians*, appendix, note iii. § 5, edit. 1871, p. 437) take the same view as that which is propounded in the text.

¹ Compare pp. 276, 277.

² Dom Maran (*Divinitas Dom. nostr. Jesu Christi*, lib. iv. cap. 29, § 2) tries to make out that the *δμοούσιον* was not condemned by the Antiochene Council of 268; but his arguments have been satisfactorily answered by the Jesuit Father de Smedt (*Dissertationes Selectae*, edit. 1876, pp. 288-297). Duchesne, in an article entitled *Les Témoin Anteniens du Dogme de la Trinité* (*Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques* for December, 1882, p. 491, note), speaking of the action of the Council of Antioch of 268, says, "Certains auteurs comme dom Maran et le Card. Franzelin (*Trin.*, p. 200 [edit. 1869, p. 192]), mettent en doute cette répudiation de l'*δμοούσιον*. Mgr. Hefele l'admet et le P. de Smedt a publié une dissertation pour l'établir. Le fait est d'ailleurs attesté par saint Athanase, saint Hilaire et saint Basile." Robertson (*Prolegomena*, p. xxxi.) holds that the fact of the condemnation "is as certain as any fact in Church history."

³ I think that S. Hilary is probably alluding to the signature of the Antiochene decree against Paul of Samosata at Sirmium in a passage of his *Liber de Synodis* (§ 88, *P. L.*, x. 540). In that passage he is addressing the Ancyrene legates, who managed the meeting at Sirmium, and he says, "Synodo Samosatene subscribendum putas, ne secundum Samosatene intelligentiam quisquam sibi usurpet *δμοούσιον*." S. Hilary evidently means by the "synodus Samosatena" the synod which condemned the Samosatene, that is to say, the Antiochene Council of 268.

⁴ By his explicit condemnation of the *δμοούσιον* and by his admission of Valens and Ursacius to his communion, Liberius was in effect ratifying the withdrawal of his communion from S. Athanasius, which, as we shall see presently, he had carried out some time during the preceding year (compare p. 283, note 2).

⁵ The fact that Basil of Ancyra, armed with imperial authority, appears to have written from Sirmium at this time, requiring the African bishops "to cast out the *δμοούσιον* from the holy Church" (see Marius Victorinus, quoted on p. 278), seems to confirm the view, at which we have arrived, that Liberius and the four African legates at Sirmium were compelled to renounce the Nicene formula as the condition of being admitted to the favour of the Emperor. What Constantianus wanted was unity of creed throughout the empire.

⁶ See the passage quoted on p. 239. Dr. Bright (*The Roman Sec.*, p. 95, n. 1), speaking of Liberius, says very truly, "To whatever extent he lapsed, he lapsed not as a private Christian, but in his public ecclesiastical capacity as Bishop of Rome."

Some writers have pointed out that, although the Council of Ancyra undoubtedly anathematized the *δμοούσιον*, the legates, who were sent to Sirmium by that council, suppressed that particular anathema when they got to Sirmium. It is suggested that such a suppression is inconsistent with the theory that these same legates induced Liberius to repudiate the *δμοούσιον*. But there is no inconsistency. We have no reason to think that the formula drawn up against Paul of Samosata, which Liberius signed, pronounced any anathema against the *δμοούσιον*. S. Athanasius tells us that the Antiochene Fathers in 268 "said in writing that the Son is not *δμοούσιος* with the Father."¹ S. Hilary says that those Fathers "rejected" (*respuerunt*) the term.² The Ancyrene legates in their epistle, which was read at Sirmium, say that the Fathers at Antioch "repudiated" (*repudiaverint*) it.³ S. Basil says that they "attacked it as being ambiguous" (*διέβαλον ὡς οὐκ εὐσημῶν*).⁴ Nobody says that they anathematized it.⁵ The objection therefore falls to the ground.

But again it is asked—Why does not S. Hilary, in his *Liber de Synodis*, refer to the repudiation of the *δμοούσιον* by Liberius, if that repudiation really took place? To this question it may be replied that S. Hilary does refer in a covert way to the Ancyrene anathema on the *δμοούσιον*,⁶ and he also refers to the fact that at the Sirmian meeting a letter was read, emanating from the Council of Ancyra or from the legates of that council, in which it was laid down that the *δμοούσιον* ought to be repudiated. On the other hand, S. Hilary carefully avoids alluding to the fact that the bishops assembled at Sirmium, including Liberius, committed themselves to this repudiation, because the whole object of his book is to induce the synods, which, as he supposed, were soon to assemble at Ancyra and Ariminum,⁷ to accept the *δμοούσιον*. He no doubt hoped that, as the Ancyrene anathema had been dropped at Sirmium, so the Sirmian repudiation would be dropped at the new synod to be assembled at Ancyra. To emphasize that repudiation and its acceptance by Liberius would serve no good purpose, but would rather raise up needless obstacles. S. Hilary was not proposing to write an exhaustive history; he was constructing an argument with the view of persuading the Easterns to adopt, in their approaching synod, a particular line of action.

¹ Cf. S. Athan., *De Synodis*, § 43, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., Patav., 1777, i. 604.

² Cf. S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, § 86, *P. L.*, x. 538.

³ *Ibid.*, § 81, *P. L.*, x. 534.

⁴ Cf. S. Bas. *Ep.* lii. § 1, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 145.

⁵ The distinction between repudiating and anathematizing theological terms was familiar to every one in the fourth century. Thus in the year 359 the Acacians at Seleucia, in the preamble to their creed, say, "We reject (*ἐκβάλλομεν*) the *δμοούσιον* and the *δμοιοούσιον*, as alien to the Scriptures; but we anathematize the *ἀνόμοιον*, and account all who profess it as aliens from the Church" (S. Athan., *De Synodis*, § 29, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 596). See also Petavius' note (44) to S. Epiph., *Haer.* lxxiii. 2 (*P. G.* xlii. 404).

⁶ Cf. S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, § 90, *P. L.*, x. 542.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 8, *P. L.*, x. 485. Afterwards the place of meeting for the Eastern synod was changed from Ancyra to Seleucia in Isauria. The Benedictines, in their preface to the *De Synodis* (*P. L.*, x. 471, 472), argue that that treatise must have been written by S. Hilary at the end of 358 or at the beginning of 359. Dr. Gwatkin (*Studies*, p. 164) says that it was written "about the end of 358."

Others have asked whether the fact that Sozomen mentions as a *false* rumour¹ the report circulated by Eudoxius of Antioch and the Anomoeans that Liberius had condemned the *δμοούσιον* and had admitted the *ἀνόμιον*, is not inconsistent with the notion that Liberius ever repudiated the *δμοούσιον*. But to that objection I reply that, when Eudoxius and his friends spread that report, it was undoubtedly a *false* rumour. It referred to what Liberius was supposed to have done at Beroea in 357.² It had nothing to do with his action at Sirmium in 358, for the rumour was circulated before Liberius came to Sirmium. What is very noteworthy is that, when, in consequence of Eudoxius' report, Liberius drew up at Sirmium a personal confession of his faith, he dealt with only the second part of the report. He dealt, that is, with the rumour that he had admitted the *ἀνόμιον*, and with that rumour only. He contradicted it in the most trenchant fashion by excommunicating all those who should declare that the Son is not like (*ὅμοιον*) to the Father

¹ Cf. Sozom. *H. E.*, iv. 15.

² I have no doubt that Liberius did do something bad at Beroea in 357, although what he did was not the particular crime with which he was charged in the report circulated by Eudoxius. My belief is that in that year he withdrew his communion from S. Athanasius, and perhaps entered into communion with some of the Arianizing court-bishops. S. Athanasius (*Hist. Arian.*, § 35), describing events that happened in the year 355, tells us that Constantius sent the eunuch Eusebius to Rome, and that the said eunuch "proposed to Liberius to subscribe against Athanasius, and to hold communion with the Arians." Liberius refused to accede to this proposal, and in that same year, 355, he was banished to Beroea, in Thrace. In § 41 S. Athanasius describes Liberius' lapse thus: "But Liberius, having been banished, after a period of two years succumbed, and, frightened by threats of being put to death, subscribed. Yet even this only shows their violent conduct, and the hatred of Liberius against the heresy and his support of Athanasius, so long as he was suffered to exercise a free choice." We cannot put the lapse here described later than 357, and it is evident that at least one element in the catastrophe was the withdrawal of Liberius' support from S. Athanasius. In regard to the meaning of the words, "after a period of two years," one may note that the author of the document entitled "*Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos*" (§ 3, *Collect. Avellan.*, ed. Günther, p. 2), after describing the banishment of Liberius, says, "Post annos duos venit Romam Constantius imperator." Now, we know from other sources that Constantius' sojourn in Rome lasted from April 28 to May 29 in the year 357. The author of the above-quoted document goes on to say that "tertio anno redit Liberius, cui obvium cum gaudio populus Romanus exivit." This return took place on August 2, 358 (cf. Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, tom. i. p. 208, et p. 209). Thus 357 was the second year, and 358 was the third year, of Liberius' banishment. Sozomen, who describes Liberius' action at Sirmium in 358, says nothing about any threats of death or of any withdrawal of communion from S. Athanasius. Those matters have to do with the period when Liberius was at Beroea. It is evident that Duchesne agrees that Liberius yielded in a measure, when he was at Beroea in 357. He says (*Lib. Pont.*, tom. i. p. 208, n. 7), "Indépendamment des concessions faites à Bérée, en 357, sur lesquelles il n'y a pas lieu d'insister ici, Libère, rappelé en 358 de son exil et transféré à Sirmium, signa," etc. I see no reason why Liberius' preliminary fall at Beroea may not have taken place early in the year 357, and if so it preceded the death of Leontius of Antioch, and there would be no reason why the 41st section of S. Athanasius' *Historia Arianorum* may not have stood, as we have it now, in what may be called the first edition of that work. But neither is there any difficulty in supposing that the sentence about Liberius' fall was added by S. Athanasius later on. Examples of such additions are not wanting. He added a postscript (capp. 30 and 31) to his *De Synodis* (see Gwatkin's *Studies*, p. 176, n. 2); and there was also an "added

in essence (κατ' οὐσίαν) and in all respects (κατὰ πάντα). But he said nothing at all in this personal confession about the *δμοούσιον*. The rumour of his having condemned the *δμοούσιον*, which had been untrue in 357, had unfortunately become true in 358, and he therefore passed it over in silence.

But again, it is argued that Sozomen never says that Liberius *signed* the composite formulary which repudiated the *δμοούσιον*, but only that he "consented" (συνανέσαι) to it. To that quibble I reply that, as the only object of signature in such cases is to attest consent, and as it is admitted that Sozomen asserts that Liberius consented, it is hardly worth while to discuss the particular mode in which the consent was expressed. But one may ask the question—What possible reason is there for supposing that Liberius did not express his consent to the new formulary in the usual way, that is to say, by subscribing it? The Oriental councils of the fourth century were continually producing new creeds, which were afterwards submitted to the bishops for their signature. S. Hilary, after referring to the happiness of those parts of the Church where the creed was written, not on paper, but on the hearts of the faithful, says, "Sed necessitas consuetudinem intulit, exponi fides, et expositis subscribi."¹ We know for certain that at this very Sirmian meeting, with which we are dealing, perhaps before Liberius' arrival, Valens and Ursacius subscribed some formula,² probably a selection from among the Ancyrene anathemas. When the composite formulary had been put together, it would be proposed for signature as a matter of course. And S. Jerome tells us that "Liberius, worn out by the tedium of exile, and *subscribing to heretical pravity*, entered Rome as if he were a conqueror."³

Once more, it is urged that Sozomen does not expressly say that Liberius communicated with Valens and Ursacius at Sirmium. That is no doubt true; but the whole tenor of Sozomen's narrative implies that he did communicate with them and with all the other bishops present at the meeting. There were only two obstacles which, as things then were, would stand in the way of intercommunion between Liberius and the Easterns, among whom, for the sake of brevity, I include Valens and Ursacius. Those two obstacles would be (1) a difference of belief as to the doctrine of the Trinity, and specially as to the relation of the Son to the Father; and (2) the adherence of Liberius to the communion of S. Athanasius, whom the Easterns had deposed and excommunicated. But those two obstacles had now been removed. Liberius had repudiated the *δμοούσιον* and had accepted the *δμοιοούσιον*. Valens and Ursacius had also accepted the *δμοιοούσιον*, probably by affixing their signature to some of the Ancyrene anathemas, and by explaining that they had rejected the *δμοιούσιον* in 357, under the mistaken notion that it meant the same as the hated *δμοούσιον*.⁴ Thus there was a general agreement as to faith and creed. As regards Liberius' relations with S. Athanasius, I have already

expostulation" to the *Apologia ad Constantium* (see Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 236).

¹ *Lib. de Synodis*, § 63, P. L., x. 523.

² Cf. S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, § 79, P. L., x. 532.

³ S. Hieron. *Chronic.*, P. L., xxvii. 685, 686.

⁴ Cf. S. Hilar. *Lib. De Synodis*, § 79, P. L., x. 532.

given reasons for thinking that the pope had withdrawn his communion from the saint in the course of the preceding year.¹ Under such circumstances, the two parties would naturally communicate together.² And the fact that, after united deliberation in synod, they signed the same profession of faith, and that then the whole body of bishops at Sirmium wrote to Felix, the *de facto* Bishop of Rome, and to the clergy of the Roman Church, directing them to receive Liberius as joint bishop with Felix,³—all this surely constitutes a sufficient proof of intercommunion. Is it likely that the Easterns would restore Liberius to a position of enormous influence if he was persisting in regarding them as excommunicate? The question answers itself.⁴

Another objection which has been raised in the course of the hopeless struggle to discredit the fact of Liberius' fall may be thus formulated: If the faithful at Rome, it is said, rejected with such horror the ministrations of Felix II. because he freely communicated with bishops suspected of Arianism, how can it be supposed that they would receive with joy the returning Liberius, if he had equally communicated with men like Valens and Ursacius, and had also repudiated the *ῥμοσύσιον*—a crime which has never been imputed to Felix? The answer is that in all probability the ministrations of Felix were rejected by the great mass of the population, not so much because he communicated with Arianizers,⁵ as because he had intruded into a see which was not vacant, and of which the legitimate occupant was a *persona gratissima* to his flock. On this point I cannot do better than quote the admirable remarks of Duchesne. He says,

¹ See note 2 on p. 283.

² It was, perhaps, more difficult for Basil of Ancyra, who was in the first fervour of his revulsion from the supporters of the blasphemous creed put forth by Valens and Ursacius in 357, to communicate with those miscreants, than for Liberius to do so, seeing that he had already got on to the down-grade by his desertion of S. Athanasius. Nevertheless we know from Sozomen (iv. 24) that on this occasion Basil did communicate with Valens and Ursacius. No doubt the bishops assembled at Sirmium, whether Eastern or Western, entered into communion with each other on the basis of the formula put together by Basil.

³ Mgr. Duchesne points out (*Liber Pontif.*, i. 209) that Sozomen implies that the arrangement made by the bishops at Sirmium for the joint tenure of the Roman see by Liberius and Felix was made "du consentement de Libère lui-même."

⁴ Hefele (E. tr., ii. 235) mentions, as one of the results of the Sirmian meeting, "that Liberius from henceforth held communion with the three bishops, who, like himself, had signed the Sirmian formula." The three bishops on the Eastern side, who are mentioned *nominatim* by Sozomen as having signed, are Ursacius, Germinius, and Valens. But all the rest also signed, and all were no doubt admitted by Liberius to his communion, and they on their side admitted him to their communion.

⁵ I am not intending to deny that the fact that Felix had communicated with Arianizers would, before the fall of his rival, be made much of by his opponents, and would in the eyes of some of them be a very serious addition to the other disabilities under which he laboured; but as soon as the lapse of Liberius became known in Rome, the Liberian party would cease to bring forward Felix's former communion with Arianizers as an argument against him. Mommsen, following the *Liber Pontificalis*, is of opinion that, before Liberius' return, Felix had cut off Valens and Ursacius from his communion, and had proclaimed in a synod his adherence to the Nicene faith. There must have been many among the Christians at Rome, especially among the clergy, who would regard Nicene orthodoxy as the paramount consideration. Such persons would no doubt, if Mommsen's view is correct, side with Felix rather than with Liberius, when the struggle began.

“ La population demeura fidèle à Libère, si bien que l'empereur, auquel, du reste, Libère donna satisfaction sur certains points, se vit obliger de rappeler le pape légitime. . . . La tradition populaire sur le pape Libère ne pouvait que lui être favorable. Saint Jérôme et l'auteur de la préface du *Libellus precum*,¹ qui écrivaient sous Damase, témoignent tous les deux de l'enthousiasme qui l'accueillit à son retour de l'exil. Ces deux écrivains, Saint Jérôme surtout, ne dissimulent pas les concessions par lesquels ce retour avait été acheté ; mais ces questions de formule et de signatures n'étaient pas de nature à être bien comprises de la masse des fidèles romains ; l'arianisme dogmatique ne les intéressait que fort indirectement. Ce qui les avait blessés, c'était l'enlèvement brutal de leur intrépide évêque ; ce qu'ils voulaient, ce qu'ils réclamaient en plein cirque à l'empereur Constance, c'était son retour, sans compromis avec l'intrus Félix ; ce qui les combla de joie, ce fut le triomphe de Libère, reprenant possession de son siège malgré Félix et en dépit du gouvernement. Quant à ce qu'il pouvait avoir signé à Bérée ou à Sirmium, ils ne s'en inquiétaient guère. Les clercs, il est vrai, accordaient plus d'attention à ces détails ; la chronique de saint Jérôme et son *De viris* (c. 97),² deux livres fort répandus, même dans les régions les moins aristocratiques de la littérature, en perpétuèrent le souvenir.”³

In concluding this investigation, which does not claim in any way to be exhaustive,⁴ I would draw attention to the fact that I have made no use of the three letters, *Pro deifico timore*, *Quia scio vos filios pacis*, and *Non doceo sed admonco*, which are attributed to Liberius, and which are to be found in the sixth Fragment of S. Hilary. The genuineness of

¹ This preface sometimes bears the title, “*Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos.*” It has been referred to under that title in note 2 on p. 283. Its author was evidently an Ursinian, and for that reason would presumably have no grudge against Liberius. Ursinus was elected by the partisans of Liberius, whereas his successful rival, Damasus, had been chosen by the followers of Felix ; at least so we are told by the Ursinian author of the preface. Even if the truth of his assertion is doubted, it still remains the fact that the Ursinians claimed, whether rightly or wrongly, to represent in a special way Liberius, and it is consequently not easy to suppose that they would go out of their way to calumniate him. Yet we read in the preface that Liberius, before Constantius' visit to Rome in 357, “*manus perfidiae dederat.*” The allusion is no doubt to Liberius' preliminary lapse at Beroea in 357. It follows that, if the author of the preface was well informed, that preliminary lapse took place in the early part of the year.

² Stiltinck, who sticks at nothing in his efforts to whitewash Liberius, treats these Hieronymian passages as spurious interpolations. It is interesting to notice that Duchesne, who as a critic inclines, perhaps, to the side of severity, assumes the genuineness of these passages, without thinking it necessary to make any answer or even allusion to Stiltinck's objections. Hefele also accepts (E. tr., ii. 236) the passages as authentic and truthful. I am glad to see that the *Catholic Dictionary*, a work which bears the *imprimatur* of Cardinal Manning and of Cardinal McCloskey, in its article on Liberius (p. 516, 6th edit., New York, 1887), says, “*Stiltinck and his numerous followers, who exculpate Liberius altogether, are driven to expedients which we cannot help regarding as desperate.*” It need hardly be added that Dr. Rivington does his best (*Prim. Church*, pp. 186-188) to rehabilitate these “*desperate expedients.*”

³ Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, Introduction, pp. cxxi., cxxii.

⁴ I might, for example, have quoted from S. Athanasius' *Apology against the Arians* (cap. 89), and from S. Hilary's *Liber contra Constantium Imperatorem* (cap. 11). This last passage is, however, quoted in a note on p. 272.

these letters was attacked in the last century by Stiltinck and others, and in our own times by Hefele. It is true that several Roman Catholic critics of great learning and acumen have declared that Hefele's arguments do not appear to them to be convincing, but I think that it must be admitted that, as things stand at present, the genuineness of these letters cannot be regarded as above suspicion, and I have therefore thought it fairer to refrain from building anything upon them.

Addendum to Appendix G.

In a manuscript now in the imperial library at S. Petersburg, there is a collection of epitaphs, mostly Roman, which has been published by De Rossi, under the title of the *Sylloge Centulensis*, in the second volume of his *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae*. Among these epitaphs there is one of great interest and considerable length, which commemorates a pope who is represented as dying in exile for his adherence to the Nicene faith, and who is evidently regarded by the author of the epitaph as a saint and a wonder-worker. Both De Rossi in the *Bolletino di Archeologia Cristiana* for 1883, and Duchesne in his edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* (tom. i. pp. 209, 210), make great efforts to prove that this epitaph commemorates Liberius. Duchesne, however, admits, in the course of his argument, that the supposition, which he defends, presents great difficulties. Lately Mommsen has applied himself to the solution of the problem, and in a remarkable article, entitled *Die Römischen Bischöfe Liberius und Felix II.*, which was published in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* for October to December, 1896, argues in favour of identifying the pope of the epitaph with Felix II., the rival of Liberius. Mommsen continues to adhere to this identification in the prolegomena to his new edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*,¹ published in 1898. His article at first convinced Duchesne, and the latter no longer felt able to defend the thesis which he had maintained in his notes to the *Liber Pontificalis*.² Further consideration has, however, led him to recede from his adherence to Mommsen's conclusions. He now holds that it is not possible, with our present knowledge, to identify with any certainty the pope of the epitaph. He says indeed, "Je suis disposé à laisser Libère en possession provisoire et hypothétique;" but he adds, "je considère comme grandement imprudentes les personnes qui tirent des arguments apologetiques d'un document si difficile à expliquer et d'attribution si incertaine."³ It is much to be hoped that the discovery of this epitaph will in time lead to the clearing up of some of the obscurity which hangs over the careers of Liberius and Felix II.⁴ Fuller light thrown on their careers will necessarily result in fuller light being thrown on the situation of the Roman Church during the years which intervened between the exile of Liberius in 355 and his readmission to the communion of S. Athanasius in the winter of 362-363.

¹ See p. xxix.

² See the *Nuovo Bolletino di Archeologia Cristiana* for 1897, pp. 132, 133, 137.

³ *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, année xviii. p. 397.

⁴ The Roman Church has canonized Felix II. His name is entered in the Roman Martyrology (edit. Ratisbon., 1846, p. 145) on July 29.

LECTURE IX.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—III.

From the death of Julian to the death of Valens (363-378).

ON June 26, 363, a Roman army, retreating from Persia, and commanded by Julian the Apostate, was attacked by the Persians at a place named Phrygia, on the eastern bank of the Tigris. Julian received a spear-wound in his right side, and died during the following night. The next day an officer of the imperial body-guard, named Jovian, was proclaimed Emperor by the troops. The new Emperor was a Catholic. He made a somewhat disgraceful peace with the Persians, and led his army by way of Nisibis and Edessa to Antioch. At Edessa he was joined by S. Athanasius, who had rapidly and secretly journeyed thither from Upper Egypt.¹ He accompanied the Emperor to Antioch, which was reached some time in October. Here S. Athanasius spent three months, and he naturally turned his attention to the divided condition of the orthodox in that city. There were the two separate communions—the great church ruled by S. Meletius; and the little body of the Eustathians, who now also had their own bishop, Paulinus. S. Athanasius had in old days been in communion with Paulinus; but it seems clear that the irregular and most reprehensible consecration of the latter by Lucifer had brought about a cessation of intercourse between the Eustathians and the Church of Alexandria. S. Eusebius of Vercellae, the legate of the Council of Alexandria and the representative of S. Athanasius, had refused to communicate with Paulinus, when he discovered that he had allowed Lucifer to make him a bishop. As we have seen, S. Eusebius quitted Antioch without communicating with either of the two rival bishops. An expression used by S. Basil in his 214th Epistle makes it clear that, during the twelve months which elapsed between S. Eusebius' departure from Antioch and S. Athanasius'

¹ S. Athanasius seems to have crossed the Euphrates near Hierapolis on the eighth of Thoth (September 6). Compare Robertson's *Prolegomena*, p. lxxxiv.

arrival in that city, the latter had made the action of the former his own, and had refrained from corresponding with Paulinus. We also gather from what S. Basil¹ says that in October, 363, when S. Athanasius arrived in Antioch, his first impulse was to establish intercommunion between himself and S. Meletius. S. Basil says, "The most blessed Pope Athanasius, when he arrived [at Antioch] from Alexandria, exceedingly desired that communion between him [Meletius] and himself [Athanasius] should be brought about; but by the incapacity of counsellors their union was deferred to another occasion. And would that this had not happened!"² On this passage the Benedictine editors of S. Basil observe, in a note to the 214th Epistle, "This desire of Athanasius to communicate with Meletius shows what he felt about the episcopate of Meletius, and what about the episcopate of Paulinus. . . . Athanasius, before he came to Antioch, clearly did not favour the cause of Paulinus. For at that time he was more inclined to Meletius, and 'exceedingly desired that communion between Meletius and himself should be brought about.'"³ What the argument in favour of postponement, used by S. Meletius' counsellors, was, we do not know with certainty. Very probably it was connected with the fact that S. Athanasius had not yet publicly separated Marcellus from his communion.⁴ In another letter, addressed to S. Meletius, S. Basil, referring to this same negotiation, says that S. Athanasius "grieved because he had been sent away at that time without being admitted to communion."⁵

After having received this rebuff from S. Meletius, S. Athanasius determined to overlook the irregularity of Paulinus' consecration, and to renew his ancient relations with the Eustathians. But first of all it was necessary that Paulinus should make it clear that he did not follow his consecrator, Lucifer, in his schismatic rejection of the decrees of Alexandria, and also that he repudiated the errors of Sabellius and Photinus, and also those afterwards championed by Apollinarius, with which he was supposed by some of the followers of S. Meletius to sympathize. Accordingly, in self-defence, he signed the synodical tome of the Council of Alexandria, which had been addressed to the Antiochenes, and he also

¹ Compare S. Basil. *Ep.* ccxiv. § 2, and see the Benedictine note e *in loc.* (S. Basil. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 321).

² S. Basil. *Ep.* cclviii. *ad Epiphanium*, § 3, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 394.

³ S. Basil. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 321, note e.

⁴ This agrees, I think, with Dom Maran's view (compare *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxvii. § 6, S. Basil. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. p. clxviii.).

⁵ S. Basil. *Ep.* lxxxix. *ad Meletium*, *Opp.*, iii. 181, *Λυπεῖσθαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ τότε παρεπέμφθη ἀκοινωνήτος.*

signed, by way of further precaution, an additional declaration drawn up by S. Athanasius.¹ Thus Paulinus purged himself of the suspicion of heresy, and was admitted to communion by S. Athanasius.

But that great saint, though he was naturally vexed at being refused communion by S. Meletius, retained the desire of seeing the breach between them healed. Only he did not think it right to expose himself to the risk of another refusal, and he therefore made it a *sine quâ non* that the next step should be taken by S. Meletius, and not by himself. However, in the Lent season of 372, about a year before his death, he privately let S. Basil know² that he was most anxious to be brought into fellowship with the saint of Antioch.³ No doubt the fact that he had admitted Paulinus to his communion had very much complicated matters,⁴ and had made it exceedingly difficult for S. Meletius to take the initiative in any negotiations for reunion.

It is not possible for us, who have only a partial knowledge of the facts, to pass judgement on the actions of these great saints; but it certainly seems very unfortunate that S. Meletius should have felt himself obliged to refuse S. Athanasius' request to be admitted to his communion in the autumn of 363;⁵ and it also seems very unfortunate that upon that refusal S. Athanasius should have thought it right to grant his communion to Paulinus. One must add that it seems, perhaps, still more unfortunate that S. Athanasius

¹ Cf. S. Epiph., *Haer.* lxxvii. capp. 20, 21, *P. G.*, xlii. 672. The declaration signed by Paulinus refers more than once to the tome of the Council of Alexandria, and forms an appendix to it. Any one who signed the declaration committed himself also to the tome.

² Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* lxxxix. *ad Meletium*, § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 180, 181. The observations of Dom Maran on the expression λέγεται should be noted (cf. *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxii. § 2, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. cx.).

³ S. Basil, in a letter to S. Athanasius, written in 371 (S. Basil. *Ep.* lxxvii. *ad Athanasium*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 160) had sketched out a plan for reunion at Antioch. S. Meletius was to preside over the whole body; and in virtue of the dispensing power of the Church, some arrangement was to be made which would satisfy and pacify the Eustathians, who were to be joined to the main body of the Church, as lesser streams flow into great rivers.

⁴ The difficulty arising from S. Athanasius' communion with Marcellus had been overcome. Dom Maran has, I think, successfully shown (*Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxvii. § 6, S. Basil. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. pp. clxvii., clxviii.) that in the last years of his life S. Athanasius withdrew his communion from Marcellus. See also p. 325, note 4.

⁵ S. Basil had not felt that S. Athanasius' communion with Marcellus in 363 was a reason which compelled him to refrain from communicating with that saint. He no doubt greatly regretted S. Athanasius' relations with Ancyra, and he finally succeeded in persuading the Bishop of Alexandria to withdraw his communion from the Galatian heretic. But S. Basil would have wished S. Meletius to adopt his own milder line at the critical moment in 363, when Antioch and Alexandria might have been reunited. Of course S. Basil himself refrained from all relations with Marcellus.

should have allowed Marcellus to remain in his communion for so long a time.¹

During the year 363 a large number of synods were held in both East and West, for the purpose of establishing the Nicene creed in its due place of honour, and for the purpose of extricating the churches from the results of the very general acceptance of the formula of Ariminum, into which they had been coerced or cajoled three years before. S. Athanasius, in a letter to Jovian, has given a list of some of the provinces in which such synods had been held.² In accordance with the general trend of opinion, a synod was held at Antioch during Jovian's stay in that city, for the purpose of accepting the Nicene creed as authoritative. The leaders of the synod were S. Meletius of Antioch and S. Eusebius of Samosata,³ and along with them were associated S. Pelagius of Laodicea, S. Ireion of Gaza, and other orthodox bishops, and also priests who represented that "bulwark of orthodoxy," Athanasius of Ancyra. These bishops belonged to the extreme right of the middle party of the Eastern Church. They had always accepted the substance of the Nicene faith, and they now proposed to accept the Nicene terminology. But there came also to the synod bishops, who had formerly belonged to the Homoean party, such as Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, Eutychius of Eleutheropolis, Zoilus of Larissa in Syria, and others. If it be asked what place such men had in an assembly of the saints, it may be replied that these Homoean bishops were still in canonical possession of their sees; they had, moreover, in past times, made a profession of rejecting the full Arian teaching of the Anomoeans; and they had now come to Antioch for the very admirable purpose of accepting the Nicene creed, and of explicitly repudiating the teaching of Arius as being impious.⁴ It might therefore be held that, even according to the principles laid down by the Council of Alexandria, they ought to be welcomed.⁵

¹ Duchesne (*Revue du Monde Catholique*, tom. lxiv. p. 535), speaking of Marcellus, says, "Les orthodoxes le défendent, et malheureusement le défendent trop longtemps; ce malencontreux protégé nuit étrangement à la bonne cause: il fait croire à beaucoup d'Orientaux que Rome et Alexandrie enseignent au fond la pure doctrine de Sabellius."

² Cf. S. Athan. *Ep. ad Jovianum*, § 2, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1777, i. 623.

³ The signatures of these two occupy the places of honour in the collection of signatures at the end of the synodical epistle to Jovian (cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, iii. 25); and the whole synod is described in one document as *οἱ περὶ Μελέτιον καὶ Εὐσέβιον τῶν Σαμοσατῆα* (cf. *Refut. Hypocr. Melet. et Euseb.*, S. Athan. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1777, ii. 24).

⁴ Dr. Hort (*Two Dissertations*, p. 128) describes the synod as having been "a gathering of scattered bishops, including men like Acacius, assembled to express acquiescence in the terms of communion arranged by Meletius."

⁵ Whether Acacius and his friends were sincere in their adherence to the

Hitherto the difficulty, which had been felt in regard to the acceptance of the Nicene terminology by Eastern Catholics, such as were S. Meletius and S. Eusebius, lay in the possible Sabellianizing interpretation which could be put upon the word *ὁμοούσιον*. Before they committed themselves to that term, they wished to have some guarantee that the Sabellian meaning was excluded. The fact that the Sabellianizing Marcellus was still in communion with Egypt and the West might well excite their fears. However, of late some declarations had been made on the Western side, which would tend to reassure them. S. Hilary had frankly faced the difficulty in his *De Synodis*, and had acknowledged that the word in debate was open to a Sabellian interpretation; and in the name of the West he had repudiated that interpretation.¹ S. Athanasius also, the head and centre of the Nicene party, had explained that the term *ὁμοούσιον* was equivalent to the two expressions *ὁμοιοούσιον* and *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* taken together.² S. Athanasius and S. Hilary had a right to speak in the name of the Nicenes. And so it came to pass that, when S. Meletius and his colleagues met in council in the autumn of 363, they felt that, on the basis of S. Athanasius' interpretation, they could safely accept the Nicene language. This they did in a synodical letter addressed to the Emperor.

The most important sentence in their letter runs thus: "We report to your Religiousness that we embrace and steadfastly hold the creed of the holy synod formerly convened at Nicaea; especially since the term which in it seems to some to be unusual—we mean the term *ὁμοούσιον*—has received from the Fathers a safe interpretation, according to which it denotes that the Son was begotten of the Father's Substance (*ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς*), and that He is like the Father as to Substance"³ (*ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ*

Nicene formula is a question into which we need not enter; because it has no bearing on the orthodoxy of the leaders of the council, S. Meletius and S. Eusebius, nor on that of their like-minded colleagues, S. Pelagius, S. Irenion, and others. It is probable that in all (or almost all) the Eastern synods of the year 363 there were some who accepted the Nicene formula, and who afterwards, in the time of Valens, fell back into Arianism. Two years later, Eustathius of Sebaste was received into communion by Pope Liberius on the basis of the Nicene creed, yet in 376 he is described by S. Basil as "a ringleader of the Pneumatomachi" (S. Basil. *Ep.* cclxiii. *ad Occidentales*, § 3, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 406).

¹ S. Hilar. *Lib. de Synodis*, §§ 69-71 et § 88, *P. L.*, 526, 527, 540, 541.

² S. Athan., *De Synodis*, § 41, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1777, i. 603.

³ In *The Appeal to History* (p. 17) Dr. Rivington attacks S. Meletius and S. Eusebius for this letter, on the ground that in it "they explained the terms [? term] 'Consubstantial' used of the Son, as equivalent to 'similar in Substance.'" Dr. Rivington omits to tell his readers that in the explanation of the *ὁμοούσιον*, given by the two saints and their colleagues, the formula, *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*, finds a place. Dr. Hort (*Two Dissertations*, p. 70, n. 1), speaking of the clause, *ἐκ τῆς*

πατρί¹). Here we have the synod accepting S. Athanasius' interpretation of the ὁμοούσιον as being equivalent to the two terms ὁμοιούσιον and ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας taken together, and we also find them appealing to the Fathers as having authorized this interpretation. Nothing could be more satisfactory. Dom Montfaucon rightly describes this crucial sentence of the council's letter, as being "Catholic words assuredly, so that no one may deny it."²

It appears, therefore, that at the end of 363 the whole body of the orthodox at Antioch accepted not only the Catholic faith, but also the Nicene phraseology. Unfortunately, however, they were still divided into two parts, and these parts were headed by two rival bishops. There was the great Church under S. Meletius, in communion with all the saints of the East and with almost all the Eastern Catholic bishops, which, however, had refused to admit S. Athanasius to its communion, apparently lest it should seem in any way to condone the heresy of Marcellus. And there was the small Eustathian body under Paulinus, out of communion with the Catholic episcopate of the East, and with a bishop irregularly consecrated by a man who immediately afterwards broke away into schism. These Eustathians, however, had recently been much encouraged by having been readmitted to the communion of S. Athanasius and of the Egyptian churches. Neither section of the orthodox people of Antioch was as yet in communion with the Church of Rome and with the West.

Some writers have indeed supposed, though, as I think, without sufficient reason, that Liberius and the West granted

οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, says, "Innumerable passages of his [Athanasius'] writings show that the form of language adopted in this clause was the test on which he relied above all others for the exclusion of Arianism." If it is permissible, when discussing the doctrinal accuracy of holy men, to omit the crucial expressions used in their declarations of faith, it would be easy to show that every saint in the calendar was a heretic. Dr. Rivington also cites, in connexion with this matter, a discreditable document, which is printed among the writings wrongly ascribed to S. Athanasius. On this document, see the Additional Note 70, p. 496.

¹ Socrat. *H. E.*, iii. 25. In order that it may be made clear that the Fathers of Antioch were basing their statement on S. Athanasius' explanation in his *De Synodis* (§ 41), I subjoin the two passages in parallel columns.

Synodical Letter to Zovian.

Σημαινούσης ὅτι ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ὅτι ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ πατρί (this is the interpretation of the ὁμοούσιον which the Antiochene letter says has been sanctioned by the Fathers).

S. Athanasius (De Synodis, § 41).

Ὁ λέγων ὁμοούσιον, ἀμφοτέρων, τοῦ τε ὁμοιουσίον καὶ τοῦ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας σημαίνει τὴν διάνοιαν.

For a discussion of the attitude of S. Athanasius' mind towards the letter of the Antiochene Council of 363, see the Additional Note 71, p. 497.

² *Admonit. in Refut. Hypocr. Melet.*, S. Athan. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., 1777, ii. 23, "Haec maxime verba, Catholica sane, ut nemo eat inficias, ad suspectum et pravum sensum detorquere nequicquam conatur scriptor iste."

their communion to S. Meletius in the winter of 365–366, but that, Liberius having died in September, 366, and Damasus having succeeded to the Roman chair, the latter, for what reason does not appear, withdrew from S. Meletius the communion which Liberius had granted.¹ As there was no change in S. Meletius' theological and ecclesiastical position at the time of Damasus' accession or afterwards, one would require very clear proof of such wavering action, before one could impute it to the Roman see. Moreover, it would be impossible for the first see to withdraw its communion from the third see without such a rupture producing considerable excitement, traces of which would certainly be found in the ecclesiastical historians and in the voluminous correspondence of such an intimate friend of S. Meletius as was S. Basil. But there is absolutely no trace of any such excitement, and the proofs alleged in favour of Liberius having granted his communion to S. Meletius are either founded on mistakes or are very inconclusive.

In order that this may be made clear, it will be necessary to say something about the general course of events. The Emperor Jovian died by accidental suffocation in February, 364. He was succeeded by Valentinian, a Catholic, who, five weeks after his accession, made his brother Valens his colleague in the imperial dignity. Valentinian reserved to himself the West, and assigned the East to his brother. The Eastern Emperor soon came under the influence of Eudoxius, the Bishop of Constantinople, who, as we have already seen, was a blaspheming Arianizer.² However, before Eudoxius' influence had become established, a considerable number of bishops belonging to the Semi-Arian group held during the latter part of the year 364, by permission of the Emperor, a series of synods in various provinces of Asia Minor, the most important of which deliberated for the space of two months at Lampsacus on the Hellespont. It was determined at these synods to send three bishops as ambassadors to the West,³ who were to satisfy Liberius concerning the faith of those whom they represented, to confirm the doctrine of the *ὁμοούσιον*, and to enter into communion

¹ Cf. Merend., *De S. Damasi Opusculis et Gestis*, cap. vi. § 3, *P. L.*, xiii. 146. Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Church*, p. 250) says that S. Meletius was "recognized amongst the bishops of the East by the Pope Liberius." Dom Maran (*Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxiii. § 6, *S. Basil. Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. p. cli.) says that "discessit Damasus a Liberii decessoris sui vestigiis."

² See p. 158, note 2.

³ It was because Valens was putting pressure upon them to enter into communion with Eudoxius, that these Eastern bishops determined to strengthen their position by sending an embassy to the Western Emperor and to the Western bishops.

with the Roman Church. The three bishops, who were selected for this duty, were Eustathius of Sebaste, Theophilus of Castabala, and Silvanus of Tarsus. They probably arrived in Rome towards the end of 365. Their written profession of faith has been preserved by Socrates. It included the Nicene Creed and also an express condemnation of various heresies, of which that of the Marcellians was one.¹ The same historian has also preserved Liberius' reply, which was written by him in his own name and in the name of the bishops of Italy and of all the West, and was addressed to sixty-four Eastern bishops who are mentioned *nominatim*, and also generally "to all the orthodox bishops in the East." The pope received the sixty-four named bishops into communion with himself. It is to be observed that the first name, which heads the list, is the name of the Bishop Evethius. Dom Maran suggests that in lieu of the name Evethius, should be read Meletius.² But there seems to be no manuscript authority for this substitution; and as the named bishops belonged for the most part, if not altogether, to the three vicariates of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, and as there was an Evethius who was at that time Bishop of Ephesus,³ an apostolic see and the metropolis of the vicariate of Asia, there was good reason for the name Evethius being found at the head of the list. S. Meletius never belonged to the Semi-Arian group, and his name nowhere occurs in Liberius' letter. Moreover, it is doubtful whether, in 364, he would have been willing to communicate with the Western bishops, who had not yet condemned Marcellus by name.

Liberius' reply was carried back by the three Eastern envoys to Asia Minor, and its contents were no doubt communicated to the sixty-four bishops to whom it was addressed. In the spring of 367 a synod was held at Tyana in Cappadocia, consisting, as it would seem, of bishops in communion with S. Meletius, who for the most part had not hitherto held communion with the sixty-four Semi-Arians.⁴ The letters of Liberius and the Western bishops were read at this council, and afforded to the assembled Fathers high satisfaction. We know from a letter of S. Basil,⁵ addressed to the Westerns, that the leading Semi-Arian envoy, Eustathius of Sebaste, was present on this occasion, and that it was he, in

¹ Cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, iv. 12.

² *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. x. § 5, S. Basil. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. p. lxxii.

³ Cf. Phot. *Biblioth.*, cod. 257 (*P. G.*, civ. 130), et *Acta SS.*, tom. vii. Mai., p. 254. See also Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. col. 675.

⁴ Cf. Sozom. *H. E.*, vi. 12; and see Dom Touttée's *Dissertat. de Vita S. Cyrill.*, cap. xii. § 69 (S. Cyrill. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., coll. lxxiii., lxxiv.).

⁵ Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* cclxiii. § 3, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 406.

fact, who brought to the council the reply of Liberius, to which a copy of the envoys' confession had been appended.¹ The Fathers of Tyana were able to see that Eustathius had accepted the Nicene Creed, had repudiated the Marcellians, and had been received into communion, as Bishop of Sebaste, by Liberius and the West ;² they therefore also admitted him to communion, and restored him to his see of Sebaste, or in other words, recognized that, notwithstanding his various depositions—namely, at Melitene in 357, at Constantinople in 360, and again recently by Eudoxius and his Arianizing colleagues,³ he might be accepted henceforth as the canonical occupant of the see. They also took measures to prepare the way for a general reunion of all the Eastern bishops who were ready to accept the Nicene Creed. But the holding of a large council, which was to meet at Tarsus for the furtherance of this end, was prevented by the Emperor Valens.

The Eastern envoys had brought back more than one letter from the West. They had certainly brought a letter from the bishops of Sicily,⁴ and apparently others from Africa and Gaul.⁵ It is possible also that Liberius may have entrusted more than one letter to their care. S. Basil, in a communication addressed to S. Athanasius in 371, appeals to a letter "brought to us by the blessed Silvanus" of Tarsus, as showing that the line of action in regard to the pacification of the Church of Antioch, which he was pressing on S. Athanasius, was agreeable to the views of that saint's friends and allies, the Westerns.⁶ We do not know with certainty what was contained in the letter from the West brought to Cappadocia by Silvanus, nor do we know by whom it was written. It is enough to say here that it can hardly have been the great letter of Liberius addressed to the sixty-four Eastern bishops.⁷ Nor do I think that it can have mentioned S. Meletius by name, and have admitted him to the communion of the Roman or of any other Western church.⁸ It probably recommended some general rules of

¹ Cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, iv. 12.

² This is what is implied by S. Basil's use of the expression ἀποκαθιστῶσαν αὐτόν (S. Basil, *u. s.*). Compare p. 321, note 1.

³ Cf. Sozom. *H. E.*, vi. 7.

⁴ Cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, iv. 12.

⁵ Cf. Sozom. *H. E.*, vi. 12.

⁶ S. Basil. *Ep.* lxxvii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 160.

⁷ Nothing in Liberius' great letter seems to have any bearing on S. Basil's letter to S. Athanasius. Moreover, S. Basil, in two different epistles (*Ep.* cxliv. § 7, et *Ep.* cclxiii. § 3, *Opp.*, iii. 380, 406), speaks of that letter having been brought to the Council of Tyana by Eustathius of Sebaste ; whereas in *Ep.* lxxvii. he is speaking of a letter brought by Silvanus of Tarsus.

⁸ Compare pp. 293-295.

action, which were in harmony with S. Basil's suggestions in his letter to S. Athanasius.¹

On the first of October, 366, Damasus was consecrated to the see of Rome in the Lateran basilica. And it is admitted that, whatever may have been the case with Liberius, his predecessor, Damasus, for the first nine years of his pontificate, refrained from communicating with either S. Meletius or Paulinus.² During the later portion of that period of nine years several attempts were made to re-establish intercommunion between the two churches of Rome and Antioch. It was the great S. Basil who was mainly responsible for initiating and carrying out these attempts. He occupied a unique position, which marked him out as the man who ought to undertake this work of pacification. For on the one side he was bound by closest ties of communion and friendship with S. Meletius, and on the other side he was admired and trusted by S. Athanasius, and from the year 372 onwards, through the friendly offices of that great personage, he also enjoyed the advantages which flowed from communion with the Roman see. As far as I can make out, he was for three years and a half, that is to say, from the spring of 372 to the autumn of 375, the only Eastern bishop, certainly the only Eastern bishop in the occupation of a great see, who did enjoy the communion of the Roman Church.³ It should be added that S. Basil's efforts to bring about the pacification of the Church of Antioch and to re-establish friendly relations between it and the West, formed part of a still wider plan which he was trying to carry out, for the extrication of the whole Eastern Church from its miserable condition. That miserable condition was the result of its intestine divisions and of its persecution by the Arian Emperor, Valens.

It would be interesting to narrate in detail the whole story of the negotiations. But I cannot afford the space. I must

¹ For a discussion of the possible purport of these rules, see the Additional Note 72, p. 498.

² Merenda (*De Gestis et Opusculis S. Damasi*, cap. viii. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 160), speaking of the year 373, says, "It may be inferred that up to this time Damasus had in no way granted his communion either to Meletius or to Paulinus, but had chosen to keep the matter open, lest by giving the preference to one of the parties in the Church of Antioch, he should offend the other, and should in that way shut out all hope of a reconciliation." It was not, in fact, until 375 that Damasus at last decided to give the preference to Paulinus (cf. Merend., *De Gestis*, cap. x. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 168, 169).

³ However, it must be remembered that Liberius had granted his communion to sixty-four Eastern bishops of the Semi-Arian group, whom he mentioned by name. I know of no traces of any results of this act of Liberius continuing after his death. Some of the sixty-four developed, as time went on, markedly heretical views about the Holy Ghost, and such a lapse into heresy on the part of some may have raised suspicions in the mind of Damasus about the rest.

be content with giving for the most part only a summary, reserving, however, full liberty to go into details whenever such a course should appear to be for any special reason desirable.

It was probably about the month of September in the year 371 that S. Basil took the first definite step in his peace-making enterprise.¹ He determined that, with S. Meletius' consent, he would send Dorotheus, one of the deacons of the great church at Antioch, first to Alexandria to obtain commendatory letters from S. Athanasius, and then to Rome "to move some of the Italians to undertake a voyage by sea to visit" the Eastern Church.² Dorotheus started from the Cappadocian Caesarea, taking with him letters from S. Basil, one to S. Meletius at Antioch, and another to S. Athanasius, and a third to Damasus. Speaking about Dorotheus, S. Basil writes in his letter to Athanasius, "You will welcome him, I am sure, and will look upon him with friendly eyes; you will strengthen him with the help of your prayers; *you will furnish him with a letter for his journey*; you will grant him as companions some of the good men and true that you have about you; so you will speed him on the way to what is before him."³

Whether S. Athanasius sent any of his clergy to Rome as companions for Dorotheus, I do not know; but he must have sent a letter commending both S. Basil and Dorotheus to Damasus; for later on Damasus, in sending to the East the reply of the Western bishops, arranged that it should be taken to S. Athanasius, and that S. Athanasius should send on a copy to S. Basil.

So Dorotheus set sail from Alexandria on his way to Rome, carrying with him S. Athanasius' letters of commendation and S. Basil's letter to Damasus. In that letter Basil begs Damasus to come to the help of the East, and "to send some of those who are like-minded with us, either to conciliate the dissentients and bring back the churches of God into friendly union, or at all events to let you see more plainly who are responsible for the unsettled state in which we are, that it may be obvious to you for the future with whom it befits you to be in communion."⁴ No doubt when S. Basil penned these last words, his underlying thought was that, if only good representatives of the West could come to the

¹ S. Basil had been consecrated to the see of Caesarea as successor to Eusebius, in September, 370. About Easter, 371, he sent two preliminary letters to S. Athanasius (*Epp.* lxvi., lxvii.), setting forth his plan for a mission to the West.

² S. Basil. *Ep.* lxviii. *ad Meletium*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 161.

³ *Ibid.*, *Ep.* lxix. *ad Athanasium*, *Opp.*, iii. 162.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Ep.* lxx., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 164.

East, they would soon see that the communion of the West ought to be given to S. Meletius, and withheld from Paulinus, unless the latter were willing to bring himself and his followers under the gentle rule of the legitimate Bishop of Antioch.

It will be noticed that S. Basil asks *Damasus* to send envoys. In his letter to S. Athanasius he had implied that he would have preferred, if it had been possible, that legates should be sent to the East, commissioned by the whole synod of the West. He imagined, however, that there would be difficulties in the way of such a proceeding, and he therefore fell back on the next best alternative, which was that *Damasus* should exercise his own personal authority in the matter,¹ as occupying the primatial see of the West, and as being consequently competent in such a case as this to act on its behalf.

As it turned out, Dorotheus appears to have arrived in Rome during the session of a numerously attended council of Italian and Gallican bishops.² The council had been convoked by Valentinian,³ and must have been holding its meetings during the month of December, 371.⁴ We may gather from what followed that *Damasus*, having received from Dorotheus the letters addressed to him by S. Basil and S. Athanasius, communicated their contents to the council. The proceedings of that body may be summarized as follows: The assembled Fathers condemned Auxentius, the Arian Bishop of Milan; they repudiated the Council of Ariminum; they expressed their adherence to the Nicene definition and to the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and pronounced all who held otherwise to be separate from their communion.

¹ Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* lxi. *ad Athanasium*, *Opp.*, iii. 162. "It has seemed to me to be desirable to send a letter to the Bishop of Rome, begging him to examine our condition, and, since there are difficulties in the way of representatives being sent from the West by a general synodical decree, advising him to exercise his own personal authority in the matter by choosing suitable persons to sustain the labours of a journey," etc. The thoughtful Romanist, Monsieur Eugène Fialon (*Étude Littéraire sur Saint Basile*, 1861, p. 79), speaking of this letter of S. Basil's, says, "Le ton de sa lettre laisse assez voir que c'est un égal qui demande l'assistance d'un égal, non un inférieur qui implore celle d'un supérieur. Ce n'est pas un sujet, c'est un allié en détresse, qui appelle un puissant allié. Il attache un grand prix aux décisions de l'Évêque de Rome; mais il reconnaît si bien la supériorité du concile sur lui, qu'il ne s'adresse à Damase qu'en désespoir d'obtenir des évêques d'Occident un décret commun et synodique. Encore lui demande-t-il moins une décision que des envoyés pour casser les actes de Rimini de concert avec les Orientaux."

² Cf. Theodoret. *H. E.*, ii. 17.

³ "Ex rescripto imperiali" (*P. L.*, xiii. 347).

⁴ Dr. Robertson (*Athanasius*, p. 488) says, "The name of Sabinus at the end of the Latin copy sent to the East seems to fix the date of this synod (*D.C.B.*, i. 294) to 372." As Sabinus, after going to Illyricum and Alexandria, was back in Caesarea before the end of March, 372, I prefer December, 371, as the date of the synod.

Finally, they drew up a synodical epistle,¹ addressed "to the Catholic bishops established throughout the East." In this epistle a summary account was given of the council's decisions, and a hope was expressed that it would not be long before those Eastern bishops who refused to accept the Nicene Creed, and who had now been separated from the communion of the West by the sentence of the council,² would also be deprived of the very name of bishop.³ In conclusion, the Orientals were invited to send a reply, and to make it clear that they agreed with what had been decided. A duplicate copy of this letter was also made, and was addressed to the bishops of Illyricum.

Sabinus, a deacon of the Church of Milan, would seem to have been commissioned to convey a copy of this synodical epistle to the Illyrian bishops, and he was certainly commissioned to convey copies of it to S. Athanasius and to S. Basil. Sabinus also carried with him private letters to S. Basil from some of the Western bishops, and specially one from S. Valerian of Aquileia, who, if we except Damasus, was the most important bishop present at the Roman council. The deacon Dorotheus travelled back to the East with Sabinus.⁴ They went first to Illyricum, and would seem to have attended a council in that region, for they appear to have been charged with a letter addressed to S. Basil by some of the Illyrian bishops. We do not know for certain whether these Illyrian bishops belonged to Eastern or to Western Illyricum. On the whole, it seems to me that the latter alternative is the more probable. The two deacons may have perhaps gone to Salona in Dalmatia, and from thence have sailed to Alexandria. Having delivered the letters, with which they had been entrusted, to S. Athanasius, they were sent on by him to the Cappadocian Caesarea, in order to convey to S. Basil a copy of the Roman synodical epistle, together with the other letters from the West which had been addressed to him. The envoys must have reached Caesarea towards the middle of March, 372, or very soon

¹ *P. L.*, xiii. 347-349.

² The West had synodically withdrawn its communion from eight of the Arian ringleaders in 343 at Sardica; and the Church of Rome had withdrawn its communion from the whole East, probably in 345 (see p. 234), certainly some considerable time before 354 (see p. 233). But I hardly think that the West had ever in synod made the acceptance of the Nicene Creed compulsory on those who wished to enjoy its communion, until this Roman Council of 371. Even if it had done so, its rule in regard to this point needed to be reasserted in view of the disastrous proceedings at Ariminum.

³ I give what appears to me to be the true sense; but the passage is corrupt both in the original Latin and in the Greek version preserved by Theodoret and Sozomen.

⁴ Cf. Dom Maran's *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxii. § 3, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. cx.

after.¹ It must have been a joy to S. Basil to welcome a representative of the West, bringing with him a synodical epistle from a great council of the West, for now inter-communion was restored between the Churches of Rome and Caesarea. However, the joy was by no means undiluted. S. Basil calls it "a certain moderate consolation."² The Westerns had only sent a Milanese deacon, instead of sending several Western bishops who would be able to sit in synod with their Eastern brethren, and would, by the weight of their numbers, be able to draw the whole East together into one communion. That was what the East needed;³ and it was necessary that fresh efforts should be made to induce the West to send an adequate embassy, so as to enable the divided and prostrate East to recover its health and unity.

A letter was therefore drafted, probably by S. Meletius himself,⁴ and was addressed to "the most God-beloved and most holy brethren, our fellow-ministers in Italy and Gaul, bishops of like mind with us." The pope was of course understood to be included, as being one among these "fellow-ministers in Italy and Gaul."⁵ In a salutation addressed to the whole episcopate of two great countries, it was not thought necessary to specify particularly the primate's name. The lesser was comprehended in the greater. The letter was signed by thirty-two Eastern bishops. S. Meletius' name naturally occupied the first place. Then came in due order the names of S. Eusebius of Samosata, S. Basil, S. Barses of Edessa, S. Gregory the elder of Nazianzus, S. Pelagius of Laodicea, and the rest. In the course of their letter, without naming Paulinus and his followers, they implore the Westerns to help them in their efforts to bring the Eustathians into line with the rest of the Eastern Church. They say, "The churches are reduced to utter helplessness by the war raging among those who are reputed to be orthodox. For these reasons we most certainly need your assistance, so that all who confess the apostolic faith may put an end to the schisms which they have devised for themselves, and may for the future be subjected to the authority (τῆ ἀνθιεντιῶ) of the Church."⁶ That was the Eastern view of the Eustathian position. To the Eastern saints it appeared that Paulinus

¹ Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* lxxxix. *ad Meletium*, § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 181. In 372 Easter fell on April 8 (cf. Tillemont, ix. 171).

² S. Basil. *Ep.* xc. *ad Episcopos Occidentales*, § 1, *Opp.*, iii. 181.

³ Cf. *Ep.* *ad Italos et Gallos, inter Basilianas* xcii. § 3, S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 185.

⁴ Cardinal Baronius (*Annot. Eccl.*, ad ann. 371, § xiv.) says, "Extant ipsae litterae a Meletio quidem scriptae, utpote primario totius Orientis antistite."

⁵ Compare note 3 on p. 164.

⁶ *Ep.* *ad Italos et Gallos, inter Basilianas* xcii. § 3, S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 186.

and his followers had devised for themselves a schism, and were in rebellion against the authority of the Church.

Besides signing this general letter, S. Basil also wrote a personal letter of his own, addressed to "the most holy brethren, the bishops of the West,"¹ in which he gives thanks for the letters received from them, and describes to them the woes of the East. Both in the general letter and in this personal letter of S. Basil's, a clause is appended at the end, in which the Eastern bishops generally and S. Basil personally express their assent to all that had been canonically decreed by the Council of Rome, as set forth in the synodical letter brought to the East by Sabinus.

Besides this letter to all the bishops of the West, S. Basil wrote a reply to the bishops of Illyricum, and also replies addressed to S. Valerian of Aquileia² and other Western bishops who had sent him letters by Sabinus.³

All these letters were committed to Sabinus to carry back with him to the West. Probably he did not leave Caesarea on his homeward journey until a few weeks after Easter, because it would take some time to collect the signatures of the thirty-two bishops who signed the general letter addressed to the bishops of Italy and Gaul. In the mean while the Emperor Valens had entered Antioch, either in Holy Week or in Easter week, and one of his first acts was to banish S. Meletius from Antioch for the third time,⁴ on account of his vigorous opposition to Arianism and his heroic maintenance of the Catholic faith. The glorious confessor remained this time in exile for nearly seven years. He spent these years in Armenia.

It may be presumed that Sabinus reached Rome before the end of the summer, and delivered to Damasus the two principal letters which had been entrusted to him. But for

¹ S. Basil. *Ep.* xc., *Opp.*, iii. 181.

² S. Basil. *Ep.* xci. The heading of this letter runs thus: "To Valerian, bishop of the Illyrians," or, according to another reading, "Bishop of Illyricum." As a matter of fact, Aquileia was in Italy and not in Illyricum, though it was near the border which divided the two countries. Some critics have supposed that S. Basil's letter to the Illyrians and his letter to S. Valerian were one and the same. While admitting the bare possibility of the truth of this hypothesis, I think that the view expressed in the text is far more probable. It is the view taken by Tillemont and Maran.

³ S. Basil did not on this occasion write any private letter to Damasus, because Damasus had not written privately to him. But of course the general letter addressed to the bishops of Italy and Gaul, and also S. Basil's personal letter to the bishops of the West, would be taken by the bearer in the first place to Damasus, with the intention that copies should be forwarded from Rome to the other Western bishops. As we shall see further on, on this occasion the intention of the Easterns was frustrated, and their letters got no further than Rome.

⁴ Valens had banished S. Meletius for the second time in the spring of 365; but before the end of twelve months the saint had been allowed to return to Antioch (see Gwatkin, *Studies*, pp. 236, 239).

some reason or other the letters displeased Damasus and the more precise among his clergy; and it was determined that, when a fitting opportunity should offer, the letters should be sent back to the East, and that the draft of a new letter should be drawn up in Rome, petitioning the West to send envoys to the East, which draft should be taken to the East, that it might be signed by the Eastern bishops, and then be brought back to Rome by an embassy consisting of persons of note.¹

Apparently some months elapsed before a fitting opportunity presented itself for the carrying out of this somewhat harsh and discourteous plan. At last it was determined to send back the letters of the Easterns by Evagrius of Antioch. He had been born and brought up in Antioch, and had belonged to the Eustathian party in its earlier days, before Lucifer had committed the great wrong of consecrating Paulinus to the episcopate. Very soon after that unfortunate event, Evagrius, glad, no doubt, to get away from the ecclesiastical confusion of Antioch, had accompanied S. Eusebius of Vercellae to the West. Here he had done good work in the struggle with the Arians, and he had rendered a very great service to Damasus. S. Jerome, speaking of him, says, "Who can sufficiently extol the discretion with which he rescued the Roman Bishop from the toils of the net in which he had been almost entangled by his factious opponents, and enabled him to overcome them, yet to spare them in their discomfiture?"²

¹ Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* cxxxviii. *ad Eusebium Samosatens.* § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 230.

² S. Hieron. *Ep.* i. *ad Innocentium*, § 15, *P. L.*, xxii. 331. In the next sentence S. Jerome speaks of a visit which Evagrius paid to the Emperor Valentinian, to plead for the life of a poor woman at Vercellae. Tillemont suggests (viii. 392) that Evagrius took the opportunity of his being received in audience by the Emperor to help Damasus in his struggle with Ursinus and his followers. S. Jerome implies, in the passage quoted in the text, that at the time of Evagrius' intervention Damasus' cause was in a critical condition, from which, however, it was extricated, and yet harsh treatment was not meted out to Damasus' adversaries. This seems to me to point to the action which Valentinian took with regard to the Ursinians at a date not clearly defined, but which occurred during the time when Ampelius was prefect of Rome. Now, Ampelius was prefect from January, 371, to July or August, 372. We know that at some time during that period Ursinus was by the orders of the Emperor set free from his confinement to one place in Gaul, and was allowed to wander wheresoever he willed, so only he did not set foot within the sphere of Damasus' episcopal and metropolitical jurisdiction (see pp. 517, 518). It may have been that Valentinian was on the point of setting Ursinus free altogether, and that it was Evagrius who suggested the limitation, which must have been such a boon to Damasus. Evagrius may have also discussed with the Emperor the case of Auxentius, the Arian Bishop of Milan, and may have persuaded him to convoke the bishops of Italy and Gaul to a council at Rome. Somebody must have induced Valentinian to issue that summons. If my supposition is correct, Evagrius must have seen Valentinian at Trier in the early part of 371. This note is already too long, otherwise it would be possible to corroborate my proposed date by other considerations.

Evagrius must have left Rome not later than June, 373. He seems to have reached Caesarea in Cappadocia in August. Here he had an interview with S. Basil, who, in a letter to S. Eusebius of Samosata, thus describes what passed: "The presbyter Evagrius, son of Pompeianus of Antioch, who some years ago started in company with the blessed Eusebius to visit the West, has now returned from Rome. He demands from us a letter couched in the exact terms dictated by the Westerns. Our own letters he has brought back to us, and reports that they did not give satisfaction to the more precise persons at Rome. He also demands that an embassy, consisting of distinguished men, should be promptly sent, that they of the West may have a reasonable pretext for visiting us."¹ S. Basil goes on to ask S. Eusebius to advise him as to what attitude of mind he should adopt in reference to Evagrius' proposals.

Evagrius, before he left Caesarea, had given S. Basil to understand that he intended, when he reached his home in Antioch, to communicate with the great church in that city, that is to say, with the church which acknowledged S. Meletius as its chief pastor, and which, during S. Meletius' banishment, had for one of its leaders, Dorotheus, who was still only a deacon, but was soon to be ordained to the priesthood.² However, Evagrius did not keep his promise, if it was a promise, but either joined the Eustathians at once, or refrained for the present from communicating with either party. Perhaps the second suggestion is the more probable of the two.³ The fact that Evagrius spoke in such a way as to lead S. Basil to think that he intended to communicate with S. Meletius and not with Paulinus is a very clear proof that Damasus had not yet admitted Paulinus to his communion. Evagrius had been intimately bound up with Damasus during his sojourn in the West, and was now acting as his agent in the East, so that it would be out of the question to suppose that he would speak as if he proposed to communicate with S. Meletius, if Damasus had already given the preference to the Eustathians, and had begun to communicate with Paulinus.

It is possible that, before Evagrius left Caesarea, he was joined by S. Jerome,⁴ who was travelling during the summer months of 373 from Aquileia to Antioch with a party of friends. If S. Jerome's party did not join Evagrius at

¹ S. Basil. *Ep.* cxxxviii. *ad Eusebium Samosatens.* § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 229, 230.

² Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* clvi. *ad Evagrium Presbyterum*, § 3, *Opp.* iii. 246.

³ Compare p. 310.

⁴ See the *Vita S. Hieronym.*, by Vallarsi, cap. vi. § 2, *P. L.*, xxii. 23. Evagrius had spent some little time at Aquileia, when S. Jerome was there, and had become intimate with him. He may also have met him in 371 at Trier.

Caesarea, they must have followed very soon after him, and when they got to Antioch, they took up their quarters in Evagrius' house.

S. Basil could not help feeling vexed and hurt by the treatment which Damasus meted out,¹ not only to himself, but to the whole Eastern Church, at a time when the persecutions which that Church was enduring at the hands of the heretical Emperor gave it a special claim to the sympathy of all right-minded Catholics. The action of Damasus seems to have put a stop for a time to the preparations which had been begun early in the year, for sending a fresh deputation to the West.² S. Basil had not been very hopeful in regard to any good which was likely to result from these preparations, and had refused to draw up the letters, which would have to be written, if a deputation was to be organized. However, S. Eusebius of Samosata was urgent that something should be done, and he drafted a paper of suggestions, which he sent to S. Basil. The latter transmitted this paper to S. Meletius, and requested him to indite the letter which was to be sent to the West. But in a second letter to S. Meletius, S. Basil does call attention to a subject which he thinks it might be well to urge on the Westerns. He says, "One subject did appear to me to be hitherto untouched, and to furnish a reason for writing; and that was an exhortation to them not to accept indiscriminately the communion of men coming from the East; but after once choosing one side, to receive the rest on the testimony of those first admitted to communion; and not to associate themselves with every one who sends them a written creed, on the ground that it appears to be orthodox. If they do so, they will be found in communion with men at war with one another, who often put forward the same formularies, and yet battle as vehemently against one another as those who are most widely separated."³ The matter on which S. Basil dwells in this passage was indeed one of very great importance. There is, however, no allusion to it in the letters which were finally drawn up and sent to the West by the hands of Dorotheus and Sanctissimus in 374.⁴ Possibly those envoys may have been instructed to

¹ S. Basil manifests his feelings very clearly in a letter written to Evagrius in the latter part of the year 373 (cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* clvi.).

² Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* cxx. et cxxix. It should be noted that S. Basil's 120th Epistle was undoubtedly written towards the end of the winter. Merenda is therefore wrong in supposing that it was written after Evagrius' stay in Caesarea (cf. Merend., *De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gest.*, cap. viii. § 3, *P. L.*, xiii. 160), for that took place in August.

³ S. Basil. *Ep.* cxxix. *ad Meletium*, § 3, *Opp.*, iii. 221. It is interesting to notice that in this letter, which may have been written in May or June, 373, S. Basil speaks of "the charge which has lately sprung up against the loquacious Apollinarius."

⁴ Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* ccxlii. et ccxliii.

urge the point by word of mouth. If so, it was not till 375 that the Westerns paid any attention to their arguments, and then unfortunately they granted their communion to the wrong side at Antioch, and so the confusions of the sorely tried East were intensified rather than assuaged by their intervention.

On the 2nd of May in this year 373 S. Athanasius died. Peter, one of his priests, succeeded him, but was driven away from his see by the Arians, who, during the reign of Valens, were backed by the civil power. Peter took refuge at Rome with Damasus; and he stayed there for five years. He was in communion with S. Basil, and on very friendly terms with him, but he followed his predecessor in recognizing Paulinus at Antioch.

As I have already intimated, the Antiochene priests, Dorotheus and Sanctissimus, were sent to the West in 374,¹ with letters from the Eastern bishops. One of these letters has unfortunately lost its inscription, and it has merely a brief heading—*Τοῖς Δυτικοῖς*² (To the Westerns), perhaps inserted by a scribe. There can, I think, be no doubt that it was a general letter from all the Eastern Catholic bishops who were in communion with S. Meletius and S. Basil.³ The other letter was a personal one from S. Basil, addressed to the bishops of Gaul and Italy.⁴ It is noteworthy that in the inscription S. Basil names Gaul before Italy, although among the bishops of Italy and at their head was numbered Damasus of Rome; so absolutely unconscious was the great Bishop of Caesarea of that "lordship over the universal Church" which Dr. Rivington attributes to the Roman bishops of that age.⁵

In S. Basil's letter to the bishops of Gaul and Italy a new request occurs, which had not been made before. S. Basil says, "One chief object of our desire is that through you the state of confusion in which we are situated should be made known to the ruler of the world in your parts."⁶

¹ I unhesitatingly assign to the year 374 this mission of Dorotheus and Sanctissimus, though Dom Maran (*Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxv. § 5, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. clix.) argues in favour of 376. Tillemont, Merenda, and Hefele agree in favour of 374. The arguments in favour of that date can be best read in Merenda (*De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gest.*, cap. ix. §§ 3, 4, *P. L.*, xiii. 164, 165). The envoys seem to have started on their journey to Rome early in the year (cf. Merend., *u.s.*).

² *Ep. ad Occidentales, inter Basilianas* ccxlii., S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 371.

³ This is also Dom Maran's view (cf. *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxv. § 5, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. clix.).

⁴ S. Basil. *Ep.* ccxliiii. *ad Episcopos Italos et Gallos*, *Opp.*, iii. 372.

⁵ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 222.

⁶ S. Basil. *Ep.* ccxliiii. *ad Episcopos Italos et Gallos*, § 1. Apart from any other argument, this sentence justifies the view that this 243rd letter of S. Basil belongs to the year 374, and not to the year 376. In 376 Valentinian was dead, and Gratian,

S. Basil wished that Valentinian, the senior Emperor, who was a Catholic, should be induced to put pressure on his Arian brother, Valens, with the object of stopping the persecution which was going on in the East in favour of Arianism. He goes on to request that, if this cannot be done, envoys from the West shall be sent to comfort the Easterns in their affliction, and to carry back to the West a report of their sufferings. He says nothing this time about the troubles at Antioch. Of course, he wrote a letter of his own, and did not adopt the formula sent to him from Rome through Evagrius.

We may assume, I think, that Dorotheus and Sanctissimus journeyed straight to Rome; and on their arrival Damasus seems to have convoked a council. The Eastern envoys brought back from Rome, probably in the autumn of 374, a synodical epistle, part of which is still extant.¹ In that epistle the suburbicarian bishops,² with Damasus at their head, made a full declaration of their faith; and in their declaration, though they mention no names of heresiarchs, they condemn very clearly the heresies of Arius, Marcellus, Apollinarius,³ and Macedonius. Then they say, "This, most beloved brethren, is our belief; and whoever follows

a boy of seventeen years, was Emperor in the West. What could he do to help the Eastern Catholics? On the other hand, Valentinian could and would have done a great deal if he had lived. He spent the summer and autumn of 375 in Western Illyricum, and ordered a council to be held there. The council deposed six Arianizing bishops, and wrote a synodical epistle in favour of the Nicene faith to the bishops of Proconsular Asia and Phrygia, two of the most heretical provinces in the Eastern empire. The council also sent a priest, Elpidius, to instruct the Asian bishops how to teach the true doctrine of the Holy Trinity. This priest carried a letter from Valentinian, addressed to the same Asian and Phrygian bishops. The Emperor warns the Arianizing bishops in his letter not to persecute the Catholics (compare Theodoret. *H. E.*, iv. 7, 8). It was very unusual for the Western Emperor to interfere in this way directly with the Eastern bishops, so that I can hardly doubt that Valentinian's action in 375 was the result of S. Basil's letter of 374. However, Valentinian died in November 375, and the persecution in the East was resumed. It should be noted that the Fathers of the Roman Council of 374, in their synodical letter to the Easterns (*P. L.*, xiii. 352) say, "With respect to the remedying of the wrongs, from which your charities are suffering . . . our efforts, as [Dorotheus] himself can testify, have not been wanting." What were these efforts? I suggest that, in compliance with S. Basil's request, the council wrote a letter to Valentinian, asking him to intervene in the East in favour of the persecuted Catholics. S. Basil seems to have been very much cheered when he heard that the Western Church had taken such a definite step. See his 253rd, 254th, and 255th letters.

¹ It is the fragment *Ea gratia*, *P. L.*, xiii. 350-352.

² I say "suburbicarian," because the Roman synods were, after the formation of the province of Milan, normally suburbicarian synods; and we have no reason to suppose that on this occasion there were any North Italian bishops present.

³ Although the members of the Roman Council very clearly condemn the errors taught by Apollinarius, yet they did not take account of the subtlety of that heretic and of his followers. The Apollinarians, by putting their own interpretation on the council's words, were able to accept them. Later on, Damasus had to devise another formula, which did not admit of being explained away.

it is received by us to communion. A party-coloured body disfigures its members. We give our communion to those who approve in all things our definition." In this way Damasus and his brethren made an earnest attempt to prove to the Eastern Catholics that they meant to be very careful as to the belief of such Easterns as they admitted to communion. This had been urged upon them, no doubt, by Dorotheus,¹ for it was a matter on which S. Basil felt very strongly.² But S. Basil had wished the Westerns to choose a certain number of Eastern bishops, whom they could trust, and then leave it to them to decide as to the qualifications of other Easterns claiming to be orthodox, and to be worthy of being admitted to the communion of the Church. We can hardly doubt that this point was also set before the members of the Roman Council of the year 374, by Dorotheus; but the time did not seem to those Western bishops to have come for acting on the principle proposed by S. Basil. The result was that a state of great confusion followed, especially at Antioch. In order that the reader may the better understand this state of confusion, it will be necessary to speak of a new cause of discord which was making itself felt in that unfortunate city.

During the years 373 and 374 the erroneous teaching about our Lord's incarnation, put forth by the "loquacious" Apollinarius, had been coming into prominence. In Antioch a great impulse to the spread of this new teaching was given by the perversion of Vitalis, who had been one of S. Meletius' priests. It seems that Vitalis was jealous of his fellow-priest, S. Flavian. Sozomen tells us that he seceded from communion with S. Meletius, joined Apollinarius, and presided over those at Antioch, who had embraced the Apollinarian tenets.³ Moreover, by the apparent sanctity of his life, he attracted to his party a great number of followers. The evidence seems to me to point to the year 374 as being the date of Vitalis' secession from the Church of Antioch.⁴ It was not, however, until 376 that Vitalis was consecrated to the episcopate by Apollinarius;⁵ so that for two years

¹ Dorotheus must have told the Roman Council that, so far as heresy was concerned, the East was chiefly troubled by those four special forms of unsound teaching.

² See the passage from S. Basil's 129th epistle, quoted on p. 305.

³ Cf. Sozom. *H. E.*, vi. 25.

⁴ Compare Tillemont (viii. 369). If it were necessary to believe the report which Sozomen had heard, namely, that the immediate cause of Vitalis' secession was that S. Flavian had prevented him from holding his customary interview with S. Meletius, we should have to conclude that Vitalis seceded before Easter, 372. But that date is impossible; and the report is therefore unworthy of credit.

⁵ Cf. Dom Maran (*Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxvi. § 6, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. clxiv.). Merenda takes the same view as Maran (cf. Merend., *De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gest.*, cap. x. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 170).

after his secession from the great church, the head of the Apollinarian party in Antioch remained a presbyter. Similarly, the Eustathians had been headed by a presbyter, Paulinus, for thirty-one years, namely, from 331 to 362.

Thus it came to pass that those who in Antioch believed in our Lord's true Godhead were now divided into three separate communions: (1) the great church under its bishop, S. Meletius; (2) the Eustathians under their bishop, Paulinus; and (3) the Apollinarians under their priest, Vitalis. Neither of these three bodies had been directly recognized by Damasus as having been admitted to the communion of the Roman Church; but they all of them were able to claim that they accepted the declaration of faith which had been inserted by the Roman Council of the year 374 in the synodical letter brought to the East by Dorotheus and Sanctissimus; and the Fathers of that council had said in their letter, "We give our communion to those who approve in all things our definition."¹ Thus it came to pass that, in the beginning of the year 375, all the three parties in Antioch, who were battling with each other in internecine strife, had some show of right on their side when they claimed that they enjoyed the communion of Damasus and of the whole West; and S. Jerome, writing in the course of the summer of 375 to Damasus, was able to report, "Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus all profess that they adhere to you."² This state of confusion was exactly what S. Basil had foreseen would result from the method adopted by Damasus of proclaiming that he held communion with those who agreed with the Western dogmatic definitions. The unification of the East and its reunion with the West could never be brought about by declarations of that kind. It was evident that the West would have to change its method; and it did change its method, and adopted the method recommended by S. Basil. Only Damasus was very unfortunate in his application of that method, in fact, so unfortunate that the unification of the East and the reunion of considerable portions of it with the West were postponed for the space of twenty-three years, this postponement being the result of Damasus' action.

I proceed to trace the events which immediately brought about the change of method in Damasus' treatment of the East. Those events are closely connected with two persons, S. Jerome and Vitalis. Let us take S. Jerome first.

It will be remembered that, when S. Jerome arrived in Antioch towards the end of the summer of 373, he took up his residence at first in his friend Evagrius' house. He made

¹ See pp. 307, 308.

² S. Hieron. *Ep.* xvi. *ad Damasum*, § 2, *P. L.*, xxii. 359.

that house his head-quarters for rather more than a year, and then carried out his long-cherished plan of retiring to the desert to live for a time the life of a hermit. While he was still at Antioch, two of his companions in travel, Innocent and Hylas, died; and the others returned to Aquileia, so that S. Jerome was the only one of the band who became a hermit. He chose for his place of retirement the desert of Chalcis, to the east of Antioch, where were a number of hermits, who lived in most respects a solitary life, but who were subject to a chief hermit, named Theodosius, and obeyed him as their superior. The majority of these hermits, if not all of them, must have belonged to the communion of S. Meletius. S. Jerome had, since his arrival in the East, refrained from communicating with any of the three sections into which the believers in our Lord's true Godhead were divided at Antioch. It is possible that, so long as he remained in the city, he may have been able to receive the Body and Blood of our Lord from Evagrius.¹ We cannot, however, be sure that Evagrius felt himself to be justified in celebrating the Mysteries in his own house, and on the whole, I doubt whether he did so. But whatever S. Jerome may have done, while he was at Antioch, it would seem from the expressions that he uses, that in the desert he received "the Holy Thing of the Lord" from certain Egyptian confessor-bishops² who had been banished from Egypt by Valens on account of their orthodoxy, after the death of S. Athanasius in 373. The place of their exile was Diocaesarea (now Sapphosis) in Palestine, not far from Nazareth, and they must have sent the Blessed Sacrament to S. Jerome, if they did send It,³ by the hands of

¹ As S. Jerome was living in Evagrius' house, it is probable that Evagrius also refrained from communicating with Paulinus, until the West had declared itself on the side of Paulinus. We know from S. Basil (compare p. 304) that Evagrius also refrained from communicating with the great church at Antioch.

² Cf. S. Hieron. *Ep.* xv. *ad Damasum*, § 2, *P. L.*, xxii. 356, "Nec possum Sanctum Domini tot interjacentibus spatiis a Sanctimonia tua semper expetere: ideo hic collegas tuos Aegyptios confessores sequor; et sub onerariis navibus parva navicula delitescō."

³ I say, "If they did send It," because it is possible that S. Jerome may have gone without Holy Communion during the whole of the two years which elapsed between his arrival in Antioch in the autumn of 373, and the admission of Paulinus to the communion of the Roman Church in September, 375; unless, indeed, he carried the Blessed Sacrament with him when he started from Aquileia, which is by no means impossible. If he had no supply of the reserved Sacrament, he may have contented himself with receiving letters of Communion from the exiled bishops at Diocaesarea. But the mention of "the Holy Thing of the Lord" in the preceding sentence, and the strong desire to communicate, which he must have felt, make me give the preference to the view set forth in the text. It should be noted that S. Basil, in his *Ep.* xciii. *ad Caesariam Patriciam* (*Opp.*, iii. 187), says, "All the solitaries in the desert, where there is no priest, reserving the Communion at home, communicate themselves. And at Alexandria and in Egypt, each one of the laity, for the most part, keeps the Communion at his own house, and participates in It when he likes." Similarly, S. Ambrose, in his *De Excessu*

some ecclesiastic, for there must be a distance of at least 250 miles between Diocæsarea and the desert of Chalcis. They cannot have done this often, but we may suppose that S. Jerome did all that he could to make it possible for himself to communicate at Easter. It is hardly conceivable that he could have lived for some months in the desert, refusing all the time to communicate with the other hermits, without coming to a dispute with them. Party feeling ran very high in Antioch and its neighbourhood. There were the three rival communions, headed respectively by S. Meletius, Paulinus, and Vitalis. And there was, in addition, the theological dispute as to whether the Catholic verity was best expressed by speaking of Three Hypostases in God or of One Hypostasis. S. Meletius and the East always spoke of Three Hypostases, while Paulinus and the Eustathians followed the Western usage, and spoke of One Hypostasis. There need not have been any disputing about this, but there was ; and I cannot doubt that S. Jerome's first Easter in the desert was made very uncomfortable for him by the accusations of heresy and schism, which must have been freely launched against him.

If such disputes did arise soon after S. Jerome's settlement in the desert, then the painful situation in which he found himself, a solitary Western in the midst of Easterns, who regarded him as a heretic or at least as a schismatic, would be likely to prompt him, during the course of the year 375, to write for advice to Damasus, the leading bishop in his own West, and at the same time the leading bishop in the whole Church, who was also the friend of his own great friend, Evagrius. Now, there are two letters¹ written to Damasus during the time that S. Jerome was in the desert of Chalcis, which set forth the miseries of his position, caused by the Eastern attacks on his reputation for orthodoxy. In these letters he implores the Bishop of Rome to instruct him as to the persons with whom he ought to communicate, and to tell him whether he ought to speak of Three Hypostases in God or of One. So far as I can see, there is nothing in these letters which points to a later date than 375 ; and on the other hand, there are several sentences which could not have been written after the month of September or at latest of October in that year.²

Fratris sui Satyri, lib. i. § 43 (*P. L.*, xvi. 1360), speaks of the Blessed Sacrament being taken with them by lay people going on a long voyage. Possibly Evagrius may have supplied S. Jerome in the desert with the reserved Sacrament. In later times the Church, for good reasons, withdrew from the faithful the privilege of having the reserved Sacrament in their houses and of carrying It with them on their journeys.

¹ S. Hieron. *Epp.* xv. et xvi., *P. L.*, xxii. 355-359.

² See pp. 313, 318.

In one or other of those months, as we shall see further on, Paulinus received letters of communion from Damasus, recognizing him as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, and implying that all those Easterns whom Paulinus should admit to his communion would be regarded as enjoying also the communion of the Roman Church. The Eustathians were in high delight at this recognition of themselves by Damasus, and it may be taken for granted that not many days elapsed before the news reached S. Jerome. He would assuredly be informed of them by Evagrius, if by no one else. Of course, S. Jerome must have entered at once into communion with Paulinus. All his sympathies lay with Paulinus before. How, then, can we imagine it possible that, after Rome had given her decision in this unmistakable way, a man like S. Jerome, who had received his Christian training and his baptism in Rome, should have written to Damasus in the way he does? For example, in his fifteenth epistle (*Quoniam vetusto Oriens*) he says to the pope, "I know nothing of Vitalis; I reject Meletius; I am unacquainted with Paulinus."¹ And again, further on, he says, "I beg you to let me know with whom I am to communicate at Antioch; for the Campenses² [that is to say, the followers of S. Meletius], together with their allies, the heretics of Tarsus,³ desire ardently that, being strengthened through the *prestige* which would come to them from communion with you [bishops in the West],⁴ they may preach their doctrine of Three Hypostases in its original [Arian] sense."⁵ And similarly in his sixteenth epistle, still addressing Damasus, he says, "The Church is rent into three divisions, and each of these is eager to seize me for its own. The long-established influence of the monks, who dwell around, is directed against me. I meantime keep crying, 'If any one is united with the see of Peter, he is mine.' Meletius,

¹ S. Hieron. *Ep.* xv. § 2, *P. L.*, xxii. 356.

² For the highly honourable reason why the followers of S. Meletius were called *the Campenses*, see p. 256, n. 2.

³ We may be quite sure that in 375 neither S. Meletius nor S. Basil would communicate with notorious heretics. We gather, indeed, from S. Basil's 34th epistle, addressed to S. Eusebius of Samosata (*Opp.*, iii. 113), that an Arian bishop had succeeded Silvanus at Tarsus in 369. But we also learn from his 113th epistle, addressed to the presbyters of Tarsus (*Opp.*, iii. 205, 206), that some presbyters in that city remained true to the Catholic cause, and that with them S. Basil communicated. The youthful S. Jerome jumped too quickly to his conclusions.

⁴ Observe that S. Jerome speaks of "*communio vestrae*," not of "*communio tuae*." All through both letters, when he is addressing the pope as an individual, he uses, in accordance with the custom of his time, the second person singular. Here he has in view the whole Western episcopate, and therefore he uses the plural form.

⁵ S. Hieron. *Ep.* xv. § 5, *P. L.*, xxii. 358. It is in the first two paragraphs of this letter that the exaggerated language occurs, which has been quoted above on p. 162.

Vitalis, and Paulinus all profess that they adhere to you.¹ I could believe the assertion if it were made by one of them only. As it is, either two of them or else all three are guilty of falsehood. Therefore I implore your blessedness . . . to tell me by letter with whom I am to communicate in Syria. Do not despise a soul for which Christ died."²

It is not necessary that I should set to work to prove elaborately that S. Jerome could not have written letters containing the above-quoted passages, after Damasus had openly sided with Paulinus, and had recognized him by name as the rightful Bishop of Antioch. Those passages have only to be read, and it will be perceived at once that, when the letters were written, neither of the three Antiochene parties had been explicitly recognized at Rome. Both letters must therefore have been written before October, 375, at the latest. On the other hand, there is a passage in the earlier letter, which could only have been written after S. Jerome had heard of the elevation of S. Ambrose to the see of Milan.³ Now, S. Ambrose was consecrated to that see on December 7, 374; and the news of the consecration could hardly have reached S. Jerome before the beginning of March in the following year at the earliest, and it may not have reached him before the end of March.⁴ It may, I think, be safely concluded that the two letters to Damasus were written between March and September or October, 375.⁵

It is to be noted that in his earlier letter to Damasus, S. Jerome, while professing to wait humbly for the Roman Bishop's decision as to whether he should communicate with S. Meletius, with Paulinus, or with Vitalis, does in fact press on Damasus the claims of Paulinus. He accomplishes this

¹ I have explained this claim, made by the three opposing parties at Antioch, on p. 309.

² S. Hieron. *Ep.* xvi. § 2, *P. L.*, xxii. 359.

³ S. Hieron. *Ep.* xv. *ad Damasum*, § 4, *P. L.*, xxii. 357.

⁴ In making this calculation, I take account of the comparative slowness of travelling in the winter, and especially in such a severe winter as that of 374-375 (cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* cxcviii. *ad Eusebium Samosatens.* § 1, *Opp.*, iii. 289).

⁵ I should suppose that S. Jerome wrote the second of his two letters (*Ep.* xvi.) shortly before Damasus' letter of communion, sent to Paulinus by the hands of Vitalis, arrived in Antioch. It follows that this second letter may well have been written in the middle of September. S. Jerome was evidently getting anxious because his first letter seemed to have produced no effect. There was a third letter written by S. Jerome, while he was still in the desert of Chalcis, on the subject of the dispute about the *formulae*. It was addressed to Marcus, one of the hermits of S. Jerome's desert, who was also a priest. It was written in the winter, but whether in 375, 376, or 377, I cannot say. At the time when it was written S. Jerome was much annoyed by the perpetual disputes about the *formulae*, and expressed his readiness to leave the desert when the winter was over. It does not at all follow that he carried out this intention; and, even if he did, I have no certainty as to the date of his return to Antioch. In Vallarsi's edition the letter to Marcus is numbered as the seventeenth.

by running down the party of S. Meletius. He calls that party by a nickname—"the Campenses;" he describes them as "Arianorum proles;" he characterizes their formula of the Three Hypostases as "novel;" he declares that whoever adopts that formula is really trying to assert the theory that there are three natures in God;¹ he ends up his letter by a sentence in which he implies that he fervently hopes that Damasus will not tell him to communicate with the followers of S. Meletius. Thus the general upshot of S. Jerome's letter was to set before Damasus as strong a case as was possible against S. Meletius. S. Jerome must have known well that, if he succeeded in inducing Damasus to enter into his views, the success of Paulinus was secured. Paulinus had been at the head of the Eustathian party at Antioch for forty-four years; he was a consecrated bishop; and for the last twelve years he had enjoyed, as reputed Bishop of Antioch, the communion of the Church of Alexandria. It was hardly possible that Paulinus should have anything to fear from the competition of Vitalis.

At this point it seems desirable, before considering whether Damasus took any action in consequence of S. Jerome's letters, to turn our attention to the proceedings of Vitalis. We have seen that he had broken away from S. Meletius, and had come under the influence of Apollinarius, and that the latter had appointed him to preside over those at Antioch who had embraced the Apollinarian tenets. We have seen also that, in his position as head of this newly-formed party, Vitalis claimed that he enjoyed the communion of Damasus and of the West, no doubt on the ground that he and his followers were able to accept the terms of the declaration of faith put forth by the Roman Council of 374, and that that council had said, in its synodical letter, "We give our communion to those who approve in all things our definition."²

The Vitalians, as they were called, were the smallest and the newest of the three parties into which the Antiochene believers in our Lord's true Godhead were divided; and it would obviously be an immense gain to them if they could obtain a definite recognition of their orthodoxy from the Western Church. Vitalis therefore determined to go to

¹ In his statements about the formula of the Three Hypostases, S. Jerome was unfortunate. The formula was in no way "novel." It had been used in the East, and especially in Alexandria, from the time when the word "Hypostasis" was first introduced into the vocabulary of theology; and so far from implying any taint of Arianism, it has completely prevailed in the Catholic Church over the rival Western formula of the One Hypostasis. No doubt Damasus and S. Jerome meant the same as S. Meletius and S. Basil, but fuller experience has induced the Church to canonize the language of S. Meletius and S. Basil, and to reject the language of Damasus and S. Jerome.

² See p. 308.

Rome and visit Damasus. He probably started from Antioch not very long after Easter, in the year 375; and he may have arrived in Rome during the month of June.

We may be quite sure, on *a priori* grounds, that Damasus was well informed concerning the charge of heresy which was brought against Apollinarius and Vitalis. The partisans of S. Meletius and the partisans of Paulinus would be not less desirous than Vitalis of obtaining the support of Damasus. We may well suppose that Dorotheus and Sanctissimus, who had visited Damasus in Rome, would write letters, in which they would press on the Roman bishop the view about Vitalis which was current among the followers of S. Meletius. Paulinus may, perhaps, have expressed his own views in one or more communications addressed to the pope. And in any case Damasus' friend and agent, Evagrius, the one ecclesiastic in Antioch who undoubtedly enjoyed the communion of the Roman see, could hardly fail to write from time to time to Rome, and he would assuredly set forth in his letters his opinions in regard to the orthodoxy and to the claims of the rival leaders who divided the allegiance of the Antiochene believers.

Certain it is that, when Vitalis arrived in Rome, the pope demanded of him a written statement of his belief in regard to those points connected with the doctrine of the Incarnation, about which Apollinarius and his friends were charged with holding heretical views. Vitalis drew up a declaration of his faith, which appeared on the face of it to be Catholic, but was susceptible of an Apollinarian interpretation.¹ Damasus was deceived by this manœuvre, and recognized the orthodoxy of Vitalis' declaration. However, he appears to have thought it best that the final decision of the question about the orthodoxy of Vitalis and his adherents should be decided at Antioch.

It seems to have been in connexion with this matter of the reception of Vitalis into Catholic communion, that Damasus came to the determination that he would grant the communion of the Roman Church to Paulinus, and would recognize him as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch. More than one consideration may have moved him to take this step at this time. But there was one which deserves, I think, special mention. The first of the two letters addressed by S. Jerome to Damasus in the year 375, probably arrived in Rome about the same time as Vitalis, or perhaps a little earlier. That

¹ S. Gregory Nazianzen (*Ep. cii. ad Cledonium, Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 96) speaks of Vitalis having by guile taken advantage of the simplicity of Damasus. Merenda (*De S. Damasi Opuscula et Gestis*, cap. x. § 1, *P. L.*, xiii. 168) thinks that Damasus actually admitted Vitalis to communion during his stay in Rome. This may be so, but I see no absolute proof of it. Anyhow, he remitted the final decision to Paulinus.

letter contained an eloquent description of the miserably divided state of the believers at Antioch ; and, as we have seen, it also contained a very unfair attack on S. Meletius, and by implication a powerful pleading in favour of Paulinus.¹ One can easily imagine that such a letter would be quite capable of giving the final impulse which would decide Damasus to give the preference to Paulinus, and to enter into communication with him. It certainly is a fact that, during the summer months of 375, Damasus wrote to Paulinus three letters, one after another, with short intervals between, in which letters he fully recognized Paulinus as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, and entered into communion with him. The first two of these letters are no longer extant ; but the third, *Per filium meum*, has come down to us, many manuscript copies of it having been preserved. In some of the oldest collections of canons and of other documents belonging to the department of ecclesiastical law, this letter of Damasus to Paulinus follows immediately after S. Jerome's first letter to Damasus (*Quoniam vetusto Oriens*) ; and I have reason to think that in every case where these two letters occur together, the letter of Damasus is headed in these collections by a most interesting rubric or introductory note, which is worded as follows : " Here begins the rescript of Pope Damasus, addressed to Paulinus, the bishop of the city of Antioch, at the request of Jerome." ² There are reasons for believing that this heading is early, and that the words, " ad petitum Hieronymi," preserve for us an authentic tradition, which corroborates the view that Damasus wrote his letters of communion to Paulinus partly in consequence of his having received from S. Jerome the letter, *Quoniam vetusto Oriens*. In any case, whatever may have been the impelling cause, there can be no doubt that it was in the course of the summer of 375 ³ that Damasus wrote the letters to Paulinus, which brought the Eustathians into communion with the West.

Damasus, in his third letter to Paulinus,⁴ the only one of

¹ See pp. 312-314.

² " Incipit rescriptum Damasi papae ad petitum Hieronymi ad Paulinum episcopum urbis Anthiocenae." For information about the collections in which this rubric occurs, see the Additional Note 73, pp. 499, 500.

³ Jerome's letter, *Quoniam vetusto Oriens*, which was dispatched from the desert of Chalchis, must have been written before Damasus had admitted Paulinus to his communion, and therefore Damasus' letter, *Per filium meum*, cannot be earlier than 375. That same letter of Damasus' must also have been written before the end of 376, during the course of which year Vitalis was consecrated by Apollinarius to the episcopate, a step which must have been posterior to the visit of Vitalis to Rome. Dom Maran (*Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxiii. § 6, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. pp. cli., clii.) and Merenda (*De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gestt.*, cap. x. § 2, P. L., xlii. 170, 171) argue convincingly in favour of the year 375 as the date of the establishment of intercommunion between Damasus and Paulinus.

⁴ This is the letter, *Per filium meum*.

the three which we possess, writes as follows :¹ "Damasus to his most beloved brother Paulinus, sends greeting ;—I dispatched a letter to you by my son Vitalis, in which I left all things to your will and judgement. I also briefly intimated to you through Petronius, the presbyter, that in the very moment of his starting I was to a certain extent in a state of disturbance. Wherefore, for fear that some² scruple should remain in you, and that your laudable circumspection should put off the reception of persons who should wish, it may be, to be joined to the Church, we are sending³ you a declaration of the faith, not so much for yourself who are joined with us in the communion⁴ of the same faith, as for those who should wish, by signing it,⁵ to be joined, most beloved brother, to you, or in other words to us through you. Wherefore, if my above-mentioned son Vitalis, and those who are with him⁶ should wish to be admitted to your communion, they ought first to subscribe that doctrinal definition⁷ which was established by the pious will of our fathers at Nicaea."

After these opening sentences there follows a careful statement of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, excluding and anathematizing the quibbling glosses of the Apollinarians. Paulinus is then told that he ought to receive without any hesitation those who are willing to subscribe this letter of Damasus, always supposing that such persons have previously subscribed both the Nicene Creed and also certain canons⁸ which Paulinus knows well. In the concluding sentence⁹ Damasus politely adds in effect that he does not

¹ For the most part I use Merenda's text of this letter (M), as reprinted by Migne (*P. L.*, xiii. 356, 357). Occasionally I correct Merenda's readings, using for that purpose the Freisingen MS., Cod. lat. Monac. 6243 *olim* Cod. Fris. 43 (F), and Cod. Vallicell. A. 5 (V), and Cod. National. Vict. Emman. 2102, *olim* Sess. lxiii. (S), manuscripts of acknowledged importance, which I happen to have had opportunities of consulting.

² I read, with F, S, and V, "aliquis," whereas M reads "aut."

³ *Misimus* is here the epistolary perfect, and must be translated in English by the present tense. The Ballerini are therefore wrong when they infer from the use of the past tense that Damasus had sent a dogmatic formula to Paulinus in a previous letter (see the note *f* of the Ballerini in *P. L.*, lvi. 684). If Damasus had been referring to a previous letter, he would have written *miseramus*; just as in the first sentence of this letter he writes *direxeram* and *indicaveram*. One may compare the use of *ἐπέμψα* in Acts xxiii. 30; 2 Cor. ix. 3; Eph. vi. 22; and Col. iv. 8.

⁴ I read, with V, "communione," whereas M reads "communione."

⁵ I read, with F, S, and V, "subscribentes," whereas M reads "subscribentem."

⁶ "Vitalis et ii qui cum eo sunt." These words are important, as showing that Vitalis was already at the head of a party in Antioch, before he started on his journey to Rome.

⁷ M and S read, "in ea expositione fidei subscribere;" F and V omit "fidei."

⁸ Perhaps these canons may be the canons of Nicaea and Sardica; and this is the view favoured by the Ballerini (*P. L.*, lvi. 685, note e).

⁹ I read the concluding sentence thus: "Non quod [tu—F and S] haec ipsa, quae nos scribimus, non potueris [in conversorum—F, S, and V] [susceptione—

send this dogmatic statement because he supposes that Paulinus would have any difficulty in putting together an equally good one himself; but he sends it in the hope that the knowledge that the Bishop of Rome is in doctrinal agreement with him will remove any hesitation he may have felt, and will enable him to receive converts with a mind freed from anxiety.

The three letters to Paulinus about Vitalis must have been written one after another with very short intervals between. Probably the first of the three, which was carried to Antioch by Vitalis, was the letter which announced to Paulinus that Damasus granted to him the communion of the Roman Church, and recognized him as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch.¹ The third letter, *Per filium meum*, went still further and laid down the principle that those Easterns, whom Paulinus admitted to his communion, would be regarded by Damasus as being in communion with himself. Thus Damasus at length adopted S. Basil's plan; but by giving his communion and confidence to Paulinus, who in the East was generally regarded as a schismatic,² he hindered rather than furthered the re-unification of the Church.

It may be regarded as practically certain that Paulinus received Damasus' letter of communion in September or October of the year 375.³ Not unnaturally, the Eustathian leaders were filled with joy at this piece of good fortune.

F and V] proponere; sed quod tibi consensus noster [liberam suscipiendi tribuat facultatem—F, S, and V].” In this passage M omits “tu,” and reads in one clause “convertentium susceptioni proponere,” and in the other clause “liberum in suscipiendo tribuat exemplum.”

¹ This is the view taken by Merenda (cf. *De S. Damasi Opusce. et Gestt.*, cap. x. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 168, 169); and Tillemont (ix. 245) regards it as probable. If Damasus sent a separate letter of communion to Paulinus, it must have been written about the same time as the other three, and dispatched just before the first of the three. But for myself, I incline to the view favoured by Tillemont and Merenda.

² Tillemont (vii. 29) says very truly, “Saint Basile et tout l'Orient s'unit à Saint Méléce, et traite les autres de schismatiques.” Dom Maran says much the same (see pp. 321, 322). Compare also Tillemont (viii. 350, 351).

³ It was after S. Basil's return to Caesarea at the conclusion of a certain journey to Pontus, that he received the letter from Antioch, which informed him that Damasus had granted his communion to Paulinus (cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* cccxvi. *ad Meletium*, *Opp.*, iii. 324). Now, he had started on this journey to Pontus after having celebrated at Caesarea the feast of S. Eupychius on September 7 (cf. *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxiii. § 5, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. cl.). In Pontus he had been to various places, and had stayed with his brother, S. Peter, in his old monastery on the River Iris. In his 213th and 215th epistles, written immediately after his return to Caesarea, he refers to the fact that winter is close at hand. It seems, therefore, clear that he cannot have got back to Caesarea until October, perhaps not till the middle of the month. That would mean that Damasus' first letter to Paulinus did not reach Antioch till the end of September or the early part of October. Dom Maran (*Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxvi. § 6, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. clxiv.) says, “Damasi litteras accepit Paulinus circa mensem Septembrem.” Compare also Merenda's statement (*De S. Damas. Opusce. et Gestt.*, cap. x. § 3, *P. L.*, xiii. 171).

Their party at Antioch was relatively very small, and they had been generally repudiated in the East; but now they were recognized not only by Egypt, but also by the West. They began at once to set forth the terms on which they would be ready to admit to their communion the Catholics who belonged to the great Church, which acknowledged S. Meletius;¹ and they used great efforts to bring over to their side Count Terentius, a person of importance in the official world of Antioch, who had hitherto adhered to the Meletian communion.

It is important that we should realize exactly what Damasus effected by his letters to Paulinus. There were three persons who claimed to be the head of the Catholic Church in Antioch. Each of them also claimed to be in agreement with the West as to doctrine; and each of them wished to gain for himself and his cause the strength which would come to him and to it, if his orthodoxy and his canonical status were acknowledged by the Roman see and by the West. Since the time of the Council of Sardica, thirty-two years before, Rome had been out of communion with all the contending parties at Antioch. Now at last, in the summer of 375, Rome makes her choice² and grants her communion to Paulinus, recognizing him as the Bishop of Antioch, and, moreover, making him to be in some sense her representative in the East, so that those Easterns who were admitted to his communion were also *ipso facto* admitted to the communion of the Roman Church. The case of Vitalis is remitted by Damasus entirely to Paulinus' judgement. S. Meletius' claim is evidently rejected. If Damasus had intended to recognize S. Meletius and Paulinus as joint-bishops of Antioch (which is what Dr. Rivington supposes³), he would have said so, and would have suggested some *modus vivendi*. It is clear that he did nothing of the sort. If he had done so, the Eustathians could not have acted as they did, and S. Basil could not have written as he did. Besides, as Dr. Rivington very truly says, "Rome had her doubts as to his [S. Meletius'] perfect orthodoxy."⁴ Damasus, rather more than a year later, allowed Peter of Alexandria

¹ Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* ccxvi. *ad Meletium*, *Opp.*, iii. 324.

² Merenda (*De Sancti Damasi Opusculis et Gestis*, cap. x. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 169), after quoting a passage from S. Basil's 214th Epistle, a passage which may be read below on p. 321, says, "Nullas itaque ante hoc tempus a Damaso litteras Pauliniani acceperant, quas circumferrent, adjudicatumque Paulino episcopatum probarent." Compare another passage quoted in note 2, on p. 297, and see also p. 304 and p. 348, note 5.

³ See Dr. Rivington's *Appeal to History* (pp. 16, 17), and his article in the *Dublin Review* for July, 1893 (p. 645).

⁴ *Appeal to History*, p. 17.

to stigmatize S. Meletius in his presence as an Ario-maniac.¹ Is it conceivable that the pope could have gone out of his way to recognize as joint-bishop of Antioch one whom he regarded as an Arian, or at least as an Arianizer? His whole history makes it clear that such a supposition is quite inconceivable. It is absolutely certain that Damasus in 375 recognized Paulinus as sole Bishop of Antioch. Such a decision involved a repudiation of S. Meletius' claim, and must have been based on the view that S. Meletius' institution to the see of Antioch was in some way illicit, and therefore null and void. There was not the least necessity for this judgement about S. Meletius to be formally expressed and promulgated. Rome had never recognized S. Meletius, and had never communicated with him. There was no change in her attitude towards him in 375. In Rome's view he remained where he always had been, namely, outside her communion, just as he was outside and always had been outside the communion of the Church of Alexandria. From 343 to 362 the whole Eastern Church had been outside the Roman communion.² After the Council of Alexandria in 362, those bishops, who were allowed to avail themselves of the terms granted by that council, and wished so to avail themselves, were received into the communion of Rome and Alexandria. S. Meletius had never been so received.³ He therefore

¹ S. Basil. *Ep.* cclxvi. *ad. Petrum*, § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 412, 413.

² An exception must be made in regard to those parts of the Eastern Church, with which Liberius communicated for a time after his fall. I have already pointed out that he never communicated with the Church of Antioch (see p. 232, n. 2).

³ It has been suggested that it can be proved that Damasus admitted S. Meletius to his communion, because Dorotheus, who was one of S. Meletius' clergy, on various occasions carried letters to Rome, some of which were signed by a number of Eastern bishops, of whom S. Meletius was one, and Damasus was willing to receive those letters from Dorotheus. But it is easy to show that there is no force in this argument, which is based on a misconception of the customs of the Church in the fourth century. For in the year 371, before carrying S. Basil's letter to Rome, Dorotheus had carried letters from S. Basil to Athanasius, and S. Athanasius received the letters and replied to them. Yet we know for certain that S. Athanasius was not in communion with S. Meletius (see p. 290). Similarly, in the beginning of Pope Liberius' episcopate the Eastern bishops, who had been excommunicated by his predecessor, sent letters to him, inviting him to enter into communion with them, and Liberius received these letters, read them to his own Roman flock, and also to the synod of the Italian bishops, and he further sent replies to the Easterns, but he refused altogether to communicate with them, cf. S. Hilar. *Fragm.* v. §§ 2 & 4 (*P. L.*, x. 683, 684). If it be replied that the Roman Council of 374, in its synodical letter, speaks of Dorotheus as "frater noster Dorotheus" (*P. L.*, xiii. 352), I answer that Baronius has long ago shown that the use of the word "frater" does not prove that the person so denominated is in Catholic communion (cf. Baronii *Annales*, ad ann. 492, § 10, tom. vi. pp. 471, 472, edit. 1658). For an obvious example of such a use of the term "frater," reference may be made to S. Ambrose's letter to Theophilus (*Ep.* lvi. §§ 3, 5, 6, *P. L.*, xvi. 1220, 1221), in which S. Ambrose gives the title "frater" both to S. Flavian and to Evagrius, the rival claimants of the see of Antioch, although it is quite certain that he was not in communion with S. Flavian, and it is doubtful whether he was in communion with Evagrius. Theophilus, to whom he writes,

remained where he was before. All that happened in 375, so far as S. Meletius was concerned, was that his non-recognition by Rome was emphasized and published abroad by the overt recognition of his rival, Paulinus. To acknowledge Paulinus was in effect to repudiate Meletius; because the normal rule of the Church is that there can be only one occupant of an episcopal see at one time. No doubt in some exceedingly rare cases, for the greater good of the Church, this fundamental rule has been suspended by conciliar (or in later times by papal) authority; but in 375 it was not suspended. If any one says that it was suspended, it is for him to prove it; and there is no proof possible. If such an unusual event had happened, specially in regard to such a see as that of Antioch, history would have rung with it; whereas history is silent, or rather utters her contradiction. Let us hear S. Basil. Writing to Count Terentius, he says, "The report has reached us that the brethren of Paulinus' party are entering on some discussion with your rectitude on the subject of union with us; and by 'us' I mean those who are supporters of the man of God, Meletius, the bishop. I hear, moreover, that they [the Paulinians] are at the present time (*ὑδὺν*) carrying about a letter of the Westerns, which while it commits the bishopric of the Church of Antioch to them,¹ defrauds [of his due] the most admirable bishop of the true Church of God, Meletius."² Evidently in S. Basil's view, to acknowledge Paulinus was in effect to refuse recognition to Meletius. The Benedictine, Dom Maran, that "most accurate writer of the life of Basil," as Merenda calls him,³ commenting on this epistle, correctly describes S. Basil's attitude in the following terms: "He [S. Basil] rightly denied that communion should be held with Paulinus, since in fact communion could not be held with

was certainly in communion with neither. On the subject of this note reference may also be made to the correspondence between Pope Symmachus and certain Illyrian bishops who were under the anathema of the Roman Church. That correspondence belongs to the year 512. On p. 411 I quote some sentences from the letter of the Illyrians.

¹ Rome had the right of deciding which of two contending claimants she would acknowledge as Bishop of Antioch. But her decision was not the decision of the Catholic Church. It did not, for example, bind S. Basil, who went on recognizing the claimant rejected by Damasus. The pope did not in this case exercise any primatial jurisdiction over Antioch. He simply gave the recognition and communion of his own Church to Paulinus. No doubt Damasus' decision carried great weight in the West, but it only *bound* the Church of Rome. Similarly, four years later, when S. Gregory Nazianzen began to act as a missionary bishop in Arian Constantinople, Peter of Alexandria "established" S. Gregory "by his letters" and "honoured him by the tokens of his recognition" (cf. S. Greg. Naz. *Carmen de Vita sua*, 859, 862, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 718). Of course the Bishop of Alexandria had no jurisdiction in Constantinople, but his recognition carried great weight throughout the Church, and specially in the East.

² S. Basil. *Ep.* ccxiv. *ad Terentium*, § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 321.

³ Cf. *P. L.*, xiii. 170.

him without Meletius being rejected, who was the only legitimate Bishop of Antioch.”¹ In S. Basil’s view, S. Meletius was bishop of “the true Church of God” in Antioch,² while Paulinus was head of a sect, a substantially orthodox sect, no doubt, but still a sect. Damasus by recognizing Paulinus had “defrauded Meletius” of his due, or, in other words, had rejected him. It is as clear as noon-day that in 375 Damasus had made no suggestion that the two bishops should occupy the see conjointly.

Having, I hope, cleared up the question as to what Damasus had tried to effect and what he had not attempted to effect in regard to the status of S. Meletius and Paulinus by his letters to the latter, I proceed next to consider what effect these letters had on the views and actions of S. Basil. According to Dr. Rivington, S. Basil attributed to Damasus the right to exercise “lordship over the universal Church.”³ And according to the Vatican Council, all the pastors and all the faithful are bound to the authority of the pope “by the obligation of true obedience, not only in things pertaining to faith and morals, but also in things pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world,” and the council adds that “no one can deviate from this teaching without the loss of his faith and salvation.”⁴ Did, then, S. Basil feel that he was bound to yield true obedience to the pope in a matter so closely connected with the discipline and government of the Church, as was the determination of the question as to who was the true occupant of the apostolic see of Antioch, the primatial see of the whole East? Let his own words give answer. In his letter to Count Terentius he says, “However, since we accuse no one, but on the contrary wish to be in charity with all men, especially with those who are of the household of the faith,⁵ we congratulate those who have received the letter [or

¹ *Praefat. in S. Basil. Vit.*, § ii. sect. 2, S. Bas. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. xi.

² It is necessary to protest against Dr. Rivington’s attempt to escape from the crushing force of this expression. In order that his attempt may be understood and its enormity perceived, I must quote the context. Dr. Rivington says (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 220), “He [Basil] numbers them [the Paulinians] amongst the household of the faith. But he is not prepared on that account ‘to ignore Meletius, or to forget for his part the Church under him.’ For this *also*, he says, ‘is the true Church of God.’” I have italicized the word “*also*,” by the use of which Dr. Rivington leaves the impression that S. Basil regarded the Paulinians as being, no less than the Meletians, members of the true Church of God. But S. Basil does not use the word “*also*,” or any word which could be paraphrased by “*also*,” as will be evident to any reader who will study the passage. This is not fair treatment of readers who cannot refer to the original.

³ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 222.

⁴ *Constitut. Dogmatic. de Ecclesia Christi*, cap. iii., *Collect. Lacensis*, vii. 484.

⁵ The Eustathians, unlike the Arians, were firm believers in our Lord’s true Godhead, they therefore belonged to “the household of the faith,” if that expression be taken in its wider sense.

letters] from Rome; and if, moreover, he [Paulinus] should have some honourable and grand testimony in favour of himself and his followers, we pray that it may prove true and be confirmed by their actions. *But not on this account shall we be able to persuade ourselves either to ignore Meletius, or to lose thought of the Church under him, or to consider the questions, about which from the beginning the separation arose, as small matters,*¹ or as having little importance in respect of the true aim of religion. *As for me, if any one, having received a letter from men, should pride himself on it, not only shall I never suffer myself on this account to draw back [from the position I have taken up], but even if one should have come from heaven itself,*² but should not walk by the health-giving word of the faith, I cannot regard such a one as sharing in the communion of saints.”³ In other words, S. Basil absolutely declines to allow Damasus' decision to have the smallest effect on his conduct. Damasus had acknowledged Paulinus and had rejected Meletius. S. Basil promptly informs Terentius that, as for himself, he will continue as before to acknowledge Meletius and to reject Paulinus. As we shall see, the Eastern Church, whose judgement was final in a matter such as this, which concerned the succession in the see of Antioch, ratified S. Basil's decision. It is clear that S. Basil, S. Meletius, and the whole Eastern Church were either consciously guilty of abominable rebellion against their divinely appointed head, or they did not acknowledge that view of the papacy, which is set forth in the Vatican decrees, and which has been summed up in the assertion that the pope, even in the fourth century, enjoyed a “lordship over the universal Church.” The Church by the extraordinary veneration, which she has always manifested for the memory of S. Basil, has practically decided in favour of the latter alternative.

It should further be noticed that S. Basil and the Eastern Church of his time did not accept the principle laid down by Cardinal Wiseman, when he asserted that “According to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic, and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with

¹ S. Basil is referring to the question whether it was right to speak of Three Hypostases in God or of One Hypostasis (compare note on p. 314). Dom Maran (*Praefat. in S. Basil. Vit.*, § ii. sect. 2, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. xi.) has carefully drawn out the reasons which invested this question with grave importance in the East during the episcopate of S. Basil.

² I am grateful to Dr. Rivington for his criticisms on the translation of this passage, which I adopted in the two earlier editions of this book. I gladly accept his view of S. Basil's meaning, which appears on consideration to be better than the one which I had previously taken, and better also than the view taken by the Benedictine editors of S. Basil's Works.

³ S. Basil. *Ep. cxxiv. ad Terentium*, § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 321.

the see of Rome, and who are not." S. Basil, on the contrary, regarded the Church which acknowledged S. Meletius for its bishop, and was repudiated by Rome, as "the true Church of God" in Antioch; and he regarded the Eustathian body, which enjoyed the communion of Rome, as "having no share in the communion of saints," or, in other words, as being a schismatical sect.¹

One can easily understand that S. Basil was exceedingly distressed when he heard of Damasus' action, which seemed to constitute a most serious obstacle in the way of that restoration of unity, for which he so longed. It was in the autumn of 375 and in the early part of 376 that he referred in two different letters to the haughtiness and inconsiderateness of Damasus. I have quoted one of these passages on p. 136, and the other on pp. 163, 164. He felt very doubtful whether it was of the smallest use to write any more to the West. However, the two priests of the great Church of Antioch, Dorotheus and Sanctissimus, who had been to Rome as joint-envoys from the East in 374, were preparing to go there again; and ultimately a letter was written in the name of the Catholic bishops of the East, and addressed to the bishops of the West; and this letter was carried to Rome by the two envoys. The Eastern bishops urge their Western brethren to denounce by name to the Eastern churches certain men clad in sheep's clothing, who were unsparingly ravaging Christ's flocks. The men thus singled out for mention are the pneumatomachian ring-leader, Eustathius of Sebaste, Apollinarius the heresiarch, and Paulinus the bishop of the Eustathians at Antioch. It is important that we should notice the reasons which led to this request being preferred. No place is found among them for any reference to a supposed papal jurisdiction over the East.² The bishops say, "Our own words are suspected by most men, as though on account of some private quarrels we

¹ S. Basil in effect argues *a fortiori*. He would not regard Paulinus as sharing in the communion of saints, so long as he clung to the formula of the One Hypostasis, even if Paulinus were an angel from heaven; *a fortiori* S. Basil will not feel under any obligation to draw back from his repudiation of Paulinus merely because he had received an epistle from men, that is to say, a letter of communion from Rome. Similarly S. Basil, some time afterwards, writing to S. Epiphanius (*Ep.* cclviii. § 3, S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 394), expresses his assurance that S. Epiphanius would never have entered into communion with the Eustathians, unless he had made sure that they accepted the formula of the Three Hypostases. In that same letter to S. Epiphanius, after declaring that his Church of Caesarea has communicated with S. Meletius ever since he became Bishop of Antioch, S. Basil goes on to say that he has never entered into communion with any of those who have since been introduced into the see [that is to say, with Paulinus or Vitalis], not because he counts them unworthy, but because he sees no ground for the condemnation of Meletius. This letter was written to S. Epiphanius more than a year after Paulinus had been recognized by Rome.

² Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 224) makes one of his hopeless attempts to show that there is such a reference.

chose to bear them ill will. You, however, have all the more credit with the populations, in proportion to the distance which separates your dwelling-place from theirs, besides the fact that you are helped by God's grace for the bestowal of care on those who are in distress.¹ If more of you concur in uttering the same opinions, it is clear that the large number of those who express them will make it impossible to oppose their acceptance."² Why do not the bishops add, "Above all you have for your president the monarch of the Church, whose commands will impose on all loyal men the duty of implicit obedience"? As usual, they mention every reason except the one which would rise first to the lips of a modern ultramontane.

The bishops go on to describe the tergiversations of Eustathius and the Judaic follies and damnable heresies of Apollinarius, and finally they deal seriously but in a somewhat less trenchant fashion with the case of Paulinus. In regard to him they say, "As to whether there was anything objectionable about the ordination of Paulinus, you can speak yourselves."³ What grieves us is that he should show an inclination for the doctrines of Marcellus, and should without discrimination admit his followers to communion.⁴ You know, most

¹ Dr. Rivington (*loc. cit.*) detects in these words the expression of a "consciousness of a *charisma* attaching to the Apostolic see which made it the proper caretaker of the troubled East"!!

² *Ep. ad Occidentales, inter Basilianas* cclxiii. § 2, S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 405.

³ The Eastern bishops ingeniously indicate their own dissatisfaction with Paulinus' consecration, without entering into an argument about it, which under the circumstances would have increased the tension between them and the West.

⁴ Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Ch.*, pp. 222, 223), evidently misled by Merenda (*De S. Damas. Opuscul. et Gestt.*, cap. vi. § 4, *P. L.*, xiii. 149), thinks that "ultimately" S. Basil changed his view about Marcellus. Merenda bases his theory on a complete misconception of the meaning of a passage in S. Basil's 266th epistle, which is addressed to Peter of Alexandria (S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 412). Speaking of the Marcellians of Galatia, S. Basil says in that epistle, which was written in 377, "Now, if the Lord so will, and they will be patient with us, we hope to bring the people over to the Church in such a way, as that we may not be reproached for going over to the Marcellians, but that they may become members of the body of the Church of Christ." Merenda paraphrases this sentence in a most astounding fashion. He says that S. Basil desires that the Marcellians may be so received "as to make it clear that they have never departed from the Church." In the next sentence he tries to confirm his view by following Zaccagni in rendering τὸν πονηρὸν ψόγον by the words "malitiosa calumnia;" whereas the Benedictines rightly translate them, "malum dedecus." As soon as these two mistakes have been corrected, there ensues a complete collapse of the whole of Merenda's theory about S. Basil's final change of view in regard to the heretical nature of Marcellus' teaching. He never retracted the statement which he made somewhat earlier in the year about Marcellus, namely, that "On account of his impious doctrines he went out from the Church" (cf. S. Basil. *Ep. cclxv. ad Aegypti episcopos exules*, § 3, *Opp.*, iii. 410). After Marcellus' death a number of his followers gave up his heresies, and were finally reconciled to the Church. It is interesting to notice that the Council of Chalcedon in its Allocution, addressed to the Emperor Marcian, which seems to have been either pronounced in his presence at the sixth session or sent to him in writing just before that session (Hefele, *E. tr.*, vol. iii. p. 351), expressed itself as follows: "Photinus and Marcellus invented a new

honourable brethren, that the emptying of all our hope is involved in the doctrine of Marcellus, for it does not confess the Son in His proper Hypostasis, but represents Him as having been uttered, and as returning again to Him, from whom He came forth. Neither does it admit that the Paraclete has His proper Hypostasis. . . . Of these things we implore you to take due heed. This will be the case, if you consent to write to all the churches of the East to the effect that those who have perverted these matters are, if they amend, to be admitted to communion; but that, if they contentiously determine to abide by their innovations, they are to be excommunicated by the churches. We are ourselves well aware that it had been fitting for us to sit in synod with your sagacities, and to settle these points by a common decree. But this the time does not allow."¹

To me it seems probable that Dorotheus and Sanctissimus started for Rome, carrying with them the letter of the Eastern bishops, soon after Easter in the year 376. Some time after their arrival in the capital of the Empire, there was held, probably in the course of the year 376, but possibly not till 377, a council, at which not only Damasus and his suburbicarian suffragans and, it may be, other Western bishops were present, but also Peter of Alexandria, who was still kept out of his own city by the Arians. At this synod both Apollinarius and his disciple, Timothy, were anathematized by name.² The council also sent back to the East a synodical epistle in reply to the letter of the Oriental bishops. Two fragments of this synodical epistle have been preserved,³ in which the Apollinarian tenets are

blasphemy against the Son." The council goes on to describe this blasphemy, which seems to be practically identical with Sabellianism (cf. Coleti, iv. 1760, 1761). The allocation must have been sanctioned by the papal legates, who were presiding. Hefele, following Tillemont and Dom Ceillier, thinks that it was actually drawn up by them (Hefele, E. tr., iii. 352, 353). The legates would certainly not have sanctioned such a treatment of Marcellus' name, if he had died in the communion of the Roman see.

¹ *Ep. cit.*, § 5, S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 407. The opinion of the whole West on the question of how Eustathius, Apollinarius, and Paulinus were to be treated would, of course, have great weight with the various Eastern churches, who could not meet in synod either among themselves or with the West, because of the persecution. In his 265th epistle S. Basil tells the Egyptian confessors in Palestine that they ought to have been slow in admitting the Marcellians to communion, until they knew whether such action would be acceptable to the Eastern churches, with whom they communicated, and to the Western churches, so that their action might be "the more confirmed by the consent of many." Similarly in his 266th epistle S. Basil says that he had not sent his answer to the Marcellians, because he was waiting to know the decision of Peter of Alexandria. In none of these cases was there any question of the exercise of jurisdiction by any bishop or bishops outside his or their proper sphere.

² See the letter of Damasus to the Easterns, preserved by Theodoret (*H. E.*, v. 10).

³ They are the fragments *Illud sane miramur* and *Non nobis quidquam* (*P. L.*, xiii. 352, 353).

repudiated with considerable detail of argument, and the Pneumatomachian and Marcellian heresies are rejected in briefer terms. But no names are mentioned in those fragments of the letter, that have come down to us.

In the letter which the Eastern envoys had brought to Rome, the Western bishops had once more been requested to send some of their number to the East to comfort and help the Easterns in their manifold trials. But this request, which had been fruitlessly made so often before, was again refused by Damasus and his colleagues.¹ It appears as if the West had allowed its sympathy for the suffering East to be chilled by listening to the malevolent insinuations which the Eustathians were accustomed to make in the course of their correspondence with Rome. It was during the session of this Roman council of 376 (or 377) that Dorotheus was pained and shocked by hearing S. Meletius and S. Eusebius of Samosata called Ariomaniacs in the very presence of Damasus, who seems to have made no protest and given no reproof.² S. Basil, writing in 375, says, "Those persons [the Westerns] are altogether ignorant of affairs here; and these [the Eustathians], who are supposed to be acquainted with them, relate them to the others in a partisan rather than in a truthful way."³ Cardinal Baronius alludes to this passage in his notes to the Roman Martyrology, where, speaking of the Roman bishop's dealings with the Church of Antioch, he says, "It is clear from the testimony of S. Basil that, as often happens, S. Damasus was deceived by certain false reports."⁴ The Bollandists quote and adopt Baronius' statement.⁵ Similarly Dom Maran says that S. Basil's soul "was stirred by the unjust judgements about S. Meletius, which were passed at Rome, after no examination of the affair and on the mere reports of partisans."⁶

We have thus traced the history of the long negotiations between the East and Rome, which were carried on under the guidance of S. Basil from 371 to 376 or 377. They ended unsatisfactorily, and left matters rather worse at the conclusion than they had been at the beginning; for the West was now committed to the wrong side, and the Catholic East, which was enduring a bitter persecution at the hands of the Arians, had the mortification of seeing an intruder in its primatial see enjoying the communion of the West, while its own

¹ See the first sentence of the fragment, *Non nobis quidquam* (P. L., xiii. 353).

² Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* cclxvi. *ad Petrum Episc. Alexandriae*, § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 412, 413.

³ S. Basil. *Ep.* ccxiv. *ad Terentium*, § 2, *Opp.*, iii. 321.

⁴ *Martyrolog. Rom.*, edit. Antverp., 1589, p. 80.

⁵ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. ii. Febr., p. 595.

⁶ *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxiii. § 6, S. Basil. *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. clii.

saintly leaders were flouted at Rome as Ariomaniacs. It would appear that S. Basil came to the conclusion that no advantage would be gained by continuing the negotiation, and we hear of no more embassies to the West during his lifetime. He died on January 1, 379.¹ But he lived long enough to see the dawn of the brighter day which was coming. On August 9, 378, was fought the battle of Hadrianople. In that battle Valens fell, and his body was never found. The Catholic Gratian became the master of the whole empire, in the East as well as in the West. The Arian persecution was at an end.

¹ For the date of S. Basil's death, see Rauschen's *Jahrbücher der Christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius dem Grossen*, pp. 476, 477.

LECTURE X.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE
CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—IV.

The Compact between S. Meletius and Paulinus.

WITHIN a very few weeks of the death of Valens, Gratian issued an edict which enabled all exiled Catholic bishops to return to their sees. We may well suppose that S. Meletius would hurry back, as soon as he could, to his beloved flock at Antioch. S. Chrysostom has given an eloquent description of the enthusiastic reception which he received, when "the whole city"¹ came out to welcome him.

In September, 379, he presided at a great synod which was held in Antioch. In consequence of the prolonged persecution under Valens, this was the first Catholic synod which had been able to meet in the East for many years. It was attended by 153 Eastern bishops. The fact that S. Meletius acted as president shows how entirely the Catholic East recognized his claim to be the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, and how completely it repudiated any binding force in Damasus' decision in favour of Paulinus. It was not simply that the Eastern bishops adhered to their primate, notwithstanding the fact that he was not in communion with Rome; but it was more than that: they adhered to him, notwithstanding the fact that a rival bishop, who was in communion with Rome and was supported by her, claimed to be the legitimate Bishop of Antioch and the legitimate Primate of the East.

We have already seen² that among the bishops who took part in this council were S. Eusebius of Samosata, S. Pelagius of Laodicea, S. Eulogius of Edessa, and S. Gregory of Nyssa. One great work, which the council had to undertake, was to do what it could to promote a thoroughly friendly intercourse between the East and the West; and with this object in view, to remove the absolutely unfounded suspicions which were entertained at Rome concerning the orthodoxy of the two great leaders, S. Meletius and S. Eusebius of Samosata.

¹ Cf. S. Chrys. *Hom. in S. Melet.*, § 2, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 521.

² See p. 160, note.

Accordingly, the Fathers of the council put together into one document the synodical letter, which had been sent to the East by the Roman Council of 371, and also portions of the two other synodical letters which had been sent, the one by the Roman Council of 374, the other by the Roman Council of 376 or 377. To this composite formulary the 153 bishops present at the council affixed their signatures, together with an appended clause defining in each case what the signature meant. Thus the president, S. Meletius, signed first, and appended to his signature the following clause: "I, Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, consent to all the things which are written above, so believing and holding (sentiens): and if any one holds (sentit) otherwise, let him be anathema."¹ S. Eusebius and S. Pelagius appended to their signatures a similar formula. The clauses appended to the signatures of the other bishops were shorter. This composite document contained the solemn judgements synodically pronounced by the West against all the heresies which had been troubling the East during the time when, owing to the persecution, the Eastern Church could hold no synods of her own. In particular the heresies of Arius, Marcellus, Macedonius, and Apollinarius were condemned. The fact that the document was synodically accepted and signed by the Fathers of Antioch was a demonstrative proof that the East and West were agreed as to the faith, and consequently that the accusations of heresy so persistently brought against S. Meletius by the Eustathians were calumnies.

There can be no doubt that another subject discussed at the Council of Antioch was the schism which separated the party of Paulinus from the main body of the Catholic flock in the city where the council was holding its meeting. We have no means of knowing whether any overtures were made at that time to Paulinus. If they were made, they were rejected, for no agreement between the parties was brought about during the sitting of the council.² When the council was over, embassies from both parties started for Rome, bearing letters dealing with the subject of the schism. These letters were laid before a council of bishops from the whole of Italy,³ which met at Rome under the presidency of

¹ *P. L.*, xiii. 353.

² The Bollandist, Father Van den Bosche, has some good remarks on the impossibility of supposing that any compact was made between S. Meletius and Paulinus at the Council of Antioch (cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Jul., p. 60, n. 266).

³ Pope Vigilius, in his *Constitutum pro damnatione Trium Capitulorum* (cap. xxvi., *P. L.*, lxix. 176), implies that S. Ambrose was present at the Roman Council which sent to Paulinus of Antioch the confession of faith containing twenty-four paragraphs with a number of anathemas; and Merenda has, I think, shown that that council was held in 380 (cf. Merend., *De S. Damas. Opuscul. et Gest.*, cap. xv. § 4, *P. L.*, xiii. 197-200). It follows that the Roman Council

Damasus in the early part of the year 380. This Roman Council determined to send certain of its members to Antioch, as arbiters, *to restore peace*, if that should be possible. As it turned out, the execution of this charitable project was prevented by the arrival of the news that the Goths by a two-fold irruption had invaded Western Illyricum and also the provinces south of the Balkans.¹ It is clear that the news of the Gothic rising reached Rome, certainly after the beginning of the sessions of the council, most probably after its conclusion, and this fact indicates that the council was held some time during the first four months of the year, most probably before Lent. For the Gothic irruption took place when Theodosius was desperately sick at Thessalonica, and the crisis of his illness appears to have fallen in the month of February,² though the effects of his illness were felt for five months afterwards. Theodosius did not leave Thessalonica until the early part of August, and by that time the war with the Goths was over, Gratian having bribed them to agree to a truce.³ It is evident, from what has been said, that peace had not as yet been made at Antioch when the Roman Council was in session during the early part of 380. The council would never have determined to send several bishops to Antioch to try and restore peace if peace had already been restored.

Merenda has, I think, given good reason for believing that the Antiochene Council of 379 sent to Rome as its envoy, or at least as one of its envoys, Acacius, the newly ordained Bishop of Beroea (now Aleppo), in Syria Prima.⁴

of 380 was attended by the bishops of North Italy as well as by the bishops of the suburbicarian dioceses.

¹ The Fathers of the Council of Aquileia (A.D. 381), in their letter, *Quamlibet*, addressed to Theodosius (*Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xiii. §§ 4, 5, *P. L.*, xvi. 989), say, "Utriusque partis dudum accepimus litteras, praeicipueque illorum, qui in Antiochena Ecclesia dissidebant. Et quidem nisi hostilis impedimento fuisset irruptio, aliquos etiam de nostro numero disposueramus illo dirigere, qui sequestres et arbitri *refundendae*, si fieri posset, *pacis* existerent."

² Compare Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, 2nd edit., vol. i. part i. p. 303.

³ The Gothic historian, Jordanes (*Getica*, capp. 27, 28, ed. Mommsen, 1882, p. 95), says, "Theodosio principe pene tunc usque ad disperationem egrotanti datur iterum Gothicis audacia divisoque exercitu Fritigernus ad Thessaliam praedandam, Epiros et Achaia digressus est, Alatheus vero et Safrac cum residuis copiis Pannoniam petierunt. Quod cum Gratianus imperator, qui tunc a Roma in Gallis ob incursione Vandalorum recesserat, conperisset, quia Theodosio fatali desperatione succumbente Gothi majus saevirent, mox ad eos collecto venit exercitu, nec tamen fretus in armis, sed gratia eos muneribusque victurus, pacemque, victualia illis concedens, cum ipsis inuito foedere fecit. Ubi vero post haec Theodosius convaluit imperator repperitque cum Gothicis et Romanis Gratiano imperatore pepigisse quod ipse optaverat, admodum grato animo ferens et ipse in hac pace consensit." The statements of Jordanes are confirmed by S. Prosper, who in the second part of his *Chronicum integrum* (*P. L.*, li. 585), under the year 380, says, "Procurante Gratiano, eo quod Theodosius aegrotaret, pax firmatur cum Gothicis."

⁴ Cf. Merend., *De S. Damas. Opusce. et Gestl.*, cap. xv. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 195, 196.

He no doubt carried with him the synodical letter, in which the claims of S. Meletius to the see of Antioch were set forth, and also the composite Western formulary, to which the Antiochene Fathers had appended their signatures. That document was obviously one of the highest importance, and there is proof that it was laid up in the archives of the see of Rome.¹ I have already shown that in the fourth century the reception by the pope of letters from bishops out of communion with his see in no way proved that he had admitted them or meant to admit them to his communion.² Still less did such reception necessarily restore them to his communion *ipso facto*. In fact, this practice of receiving letters from persons not in communion was by no means peculiar to the fourth century. History makes it clear that such action was not unknown at Rome fourteen centuries later than the time of Damasus. I give details in a note.³

I referred just now (see p. 330, n. 3) to a certain confession of faith, divided into twenty-four paragraphs and including a number of anathemas, which was sent by the Roman Council of 380 to Paulinus, the bishop of the Antiochene Eustathians. There is one paragraph in that confession, which remarkably corroborates the conclusion that, whatever may have been the case with other members of the Council of Antioch held in 379, at any rate the president, S. Meletius, was not in communion with the West. I allude to the ninth paragraph, which runs as follows: "Those also, who have migrated from churches to churches, we regard as alien from our communion, until they shall have returned to the cities in which they were first established [as bishops]. But if one bishop has migrated and another has been ordained to fill his place during his lifetime, let him who has deserted his city cease to enjoy the dignity of a bishop until his successor

¹ See *P. L.*, xiii. 354.

² See p. 320, note 3.

³ During the pontificate of Clement XIV., when the Jesuits were straining every nerve to prevent the beatification of Juan de Palafox, a certain letter, bearing date December 15, 1770, and purporting to be signed by Peter John Meindaerts, Archbishop of Utrecht, was fabricated by the Jesuits, or by their allies, and forwarded to Rome. In this letter the archbishop was made to suggest that the beatification of Palafox would be equivalent to a retraction of the bulls against the five propositions of Jansenius. As a matter of fact, Archbishop Meindaerts had died on October 31, 1767, more than three years before the date of the forged letter. His successor, Archbishop Michael van Nieuwenhuisen, and his suffragans drew up a formal act in which they disavowed this piece, and showed that it could not have emanated from the Church of Utrecht. Clement XIV. was much gratified by the disavowal, and ordered that the original act should be deposited in the archives of the Apostolic Chamber. See Dr. Neale's *History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland*, pp. 334, 335. It will, of course, be remembered that from 1723 to the present time the Archbishops of Utrecht and their suffragans have been out of communion with the see of Rome; and Archbishop van Nieuwenhuisen had been excommunicated *nominatim*.

passes to his rest in peace.”¹ Now, when it is remembered that this confession of faith is addressed to S. Meletius' rival, Paulinus, and, further, that S. Meletius had undoubtedly been consecrated to the see of Sebaste, and had afterwards been instituted to the see of Antioch, it is impossible to doubt that the case of S. Meletius was very prominently in the mind of the Fathers of the Roman Council of 380, when they inserted in their confession of faith that ninth paragraph, which publicly notifies the fact that all bishops who have migrated from one church to another are outside the communion of the West. I do not say that the scope of the paragraph is to be restricted to S. Meletius, but I do say that it was aimed very specially at him. Merenda himself expresses the opinion that what he chooses to call S. Meletius' "frequent migration from church to church,"² was in all probability one of the reasons which moved Damasus to side with Paulinus. Even if *per impossibile* the Council of Rome had not had the case of S. Meletius definitely in its mind, its notification that migrating bishops were not in its communion being perfectly general, and no exception being made in favour of S. Meletius, that holy man would necessarily have been included within the sweep of the council's declaration. Merenda, in his note on this paragraph, twice over speaks of it as an "anathematismus,"³ and tries unsuccessfully to exclude S. Meletius from the effect of its operation. Occurring as the paragraph does in the midst of a series of anathemas, it is possible that Merenda is right in his view of the extreme gravity of the penalty pronounced in it against migrating bishops, though I confess that I do not feel sure on that point. What does appear to me to be absolutely certain is, that whatever the penalty may have involved, it was incurred by S. Meletius, and, moreover, was primarily meant to apply to him; and this is the view which is generally taken by learned Roman Catholics. It is the view taken by Tillemont,⁴ by the Benedictines, Dom Maran,⁵ and Dom Coustant,⁶ by the very learned Ultramontanes, the brothers

¹ *P. L.*, xiii. 360, 361. "Eos quoque, qui de Ecclesiis ad Ecclesias migraverunt tamdiu a communione nostra habemus alienos, quamdiu ad eas civitates redierint, in quibus primum sunt constituti. Quod si alius alio transigente in locum viventis est ordinatus, tamdiu vacet sacerdotis dignitate, qui suam deseruit civitatem, quamdiu successor ejus quiescat in pace."

² Merend. *De S. Damas Opuscul. et Gest.*, cap. x. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 169.

³ *P. L.*, xiii. 360, 361.

⁴ Tillemont, vii. 619.

⁵ *Vit. S. Basil.*, cap. xxxiii. § 6, *S. Basil.*, *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. cli. (cf. *Op. cit.*, p. 321, n.d.).

⁶ *Epistolae Rom. Pontif.*, edit. 1721, col. 514, n.

Ballerini,¹ and even by Rohrbacher.² It will be enough to quote the Ballerini. Speaking of the paragraph containing the condemnation of migrating bishops, they say, "This pope [viz. Damasus], who was in communion with Paulinus of Antioch, inserted this decree against Meletius, who had passed from the Church of Sebaste to that of Antioch."³

I think that it will be admitted that good reason has been given for believing that in the early part of the year 380 peace had not been established between S. Meletius and Paulinus, nor between S. Meletius and the Roman Church. On the contrary, a fresh condemnation of him had been promulgated at Rome, which made it clear to all the world that he was separated from the communion of the West.

At this point in the narrative it seems desirable to speak of some of the laws in favour of the faith of Nicaea, which were enacted about this time by the Emperor Theodosius. In the early part of February, 380, while at Thessalonica, he was attacked, as we have seen, by a dangerous illness, and it was during this illness that he received instruction from S. Acholius, the bishop of that city, and was baptized by him.⁴ One may feel morally sure that it was under the influence of S. Acholius that the Emperor published, on the 28th of February, an edict addressed to the people of Constantinople.⁵ In that edict he expressed his desire that "all the various nations subject

¹ *Codex Canonum Eccles. et Constitutorum S. Sedis Apostol.*, cap. lv., n.g., P. L., lvi. 688.

² *Histoire Universelle de l'Église Catholique*, livre 35, 5^{ème} edit., 1868, tom. iv. p. 72.

³ As a matter of fact, S. Meletius was not, strictly speaking, translated from one see to another. He had been consecrated to Sebaste, but he had not been able to remain there. The people did not recognize the deposition of his predecessor, Eustathius (see p. 242). He had therefore retired to Beroea, and was in the position of a bishop without a see. Now, the great Antiochene Council of the Dedication (A.D. 341) had decreed in its sixteenth canon as follows: "If a bishop without a see forces himself into a vacant one, taking possession of it *without the consent of a regular synod*, he shall be deposed, even if he has been elected by the whole diocese into which he has intruded. A regular synod is one held in the presence of the metropolitan" (see Hefele, E. tr., ii. 71). The canons of this Council of Antioch, a "synod of saints," as S. Hilary calls it, were certainly good law at Antioch at the time of S. Meletius' institution to the bishopric of the church in that city. Later on, these canons became the law of the whole Eastern Church, and finally they were admitted into the codes of the West as well as of the East. S. Meletius' election was ratified by a numerously attended council of bishops belonging to the province and the patriarchate, and consequently no objection can be brought against the canonicity of his institution on the score of translation. The requirements of the canons had been fulfilled in his case.

⁴ Cf. Sozomen., *H. E.*, vii. 4. On the date of the baptism, compare Gwatkin's *Studies* (p. 259, n. 2) and Rauschen's *Fahrbücher* (pp. 61, 67).

⁵ *Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 1, 2. The edict begins with the words *Cunctos populos*.

to his sway should live in the profession of that religion, which has been preached from apostolic times until now, and which, according to its own tradition, was delivered to the Romans by the divine apostle, Peter, and which is obviously followed by Bishop Damasus (pontificem Damasum) and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria¹ (Alexandriae episcopum),² a man of apostolic holiness. The sum and substance of that religion is that, in accordance with apostolic teaching and evangelical doctrine, we should believe the one Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in equal majesty and in a holy Trinity." "We order," he says, "that those who follow this law should assume the name of Catholic Christians; but pronouncing all others to be mad and foolish, we require that they shall bear the ignominious name of heretics, and shall not presume to bestow on their conventicles the title of churches. Such persons will be chastised, first by the divine vengeance, and secondarily by the punishment which the impulse, moving our will in accordance with the decision of heaven, shall inflict."³

¹ Similarly S. Jerome, some three or four years before, when he was in the desert of Chalcis, appealed to the usage of Damasus and Peter in support of his right to use the formula of the One Hypostasis (cf. S. Hieronym. *Ep.* xvii. *ad Marcum*, § 2, *P. L.*, xxii. 360). A Western would naturally refer to those two great prelates as pillars of orthodoxy.

² Some papalist writers have laid stress on the fact that Theodosius styles Damasus "pontifex" and Peter "episcopus." But, as Baronius in his *Annals* (s.a. 397, tom. v. p. 42, edit. 1658) points out, "Fuit olim vetus ille usus in Ecclesia, ut episcopi omnes non pontifices tantum dicerentur, sed summi pontifices vel summi sacerdotes, eo quod episcopatus summum sacerdotium diceretur." Compare Pope Zosimus' letter to Hesychius of Salona (*P. L.*, xx. 671), and Pope Gelasius' letter to the bishops of Lucania (S. Gelas. *Ep.* ix. cap. 6, *P. L.*, lix. 50). In Theodosius' edict the word is probably varied for the sake of euphony.

³ This edict bears on its forefront that Western tinge which was to be expected in a document emanating from men with the antecedents of Theodosius and S. Acholius. Theodosius had spent all his life within the limits of the Western empire; and S. Acholius, though born in the East, had come to the West in boyhood, and had remained there ever since. Theodosius was soon to come into contact with the Eastern Church, and the short experience of a few months in the East led him to give a very different complexion to his legislation about the tests of orthodoxy. On July 30, 381, he decreed (*Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 1, 3), on the advice of the second Ecumenical Council (cf. S. Greg. Nyss. *Ep.* i. *ad Flavianum*, *P. G.*, xlii. 1009), that the churches were to be handed over to the bishops who believed in the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and who were manifestly associated in communion with Nectarius of Constantinople, and, if their sees were in Egypt, with Timothy of Alexandria; if they lived in the *Oriens*, with S. Pelagius of Laodicea and with Diodorus of Tarsus; if in Asia, with S. Amphilocheus of Iconium and with Optimus of the Pisidian Antioch; if in Pontus, with Helladius of Caesarea, Otreius of Melitene, and S. Gregory of Nyssa. Two other bishops, whose dioceses were north of the Balkans, are also mentioned as centres of communion—Terentius of Scythia and Martyrius of Marcianopolis. It will be observed that Damasus is conspicuous by his absence, and that Nectarius of Constantinople is given a primatial position at the head of the list. The arrangement seems to have been well devised and suitable for the needs of the Eastern Church.

It will be observed that this law contains for the most part a programme of Theodosius' wishes and intentions, rather than an enactment which could of itself take effect. It obviously needed to be supplemented. The Emperor thought it well to interpose a delay of nearly nine months before he took any further action. But after his solemn entry into Constantinople on the 14th of November he sent for the bishop, Demophilus, who was an Arian, and asked him whether he was willing to assent to the Nicene creed. Demophilus honourably refused. Whereupon the Emperor gave orders that the Arians should give up the churches in the city, which had been in their possession for forty years. This order was carried into effect, and the churches were handed over to the Catholics. Thus the work of imperial coercion on behalf of Nicene orthodoxy was begun.

In a few weeks' time Theodosius extended to the whole of the Eastern empire the policy which he had inaugurated in the capital. On January 10, 381, he addressed to Eutropius, who was prefect of the praetorium, the law *Nullus haereticis*.¹ In that law, speaking of those who repudiate the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as set forth at Nicaea, Theodosius says, "Let them be kept entirely away from even the thresholds of the churches, since we allow no heretics to hold their unlawful assemblies within the towns. If they attempt any outbreak, we order that their rage shall be quelled and that they shall be cast forth outside the walls of the cities, so that the Catholic churches throughout the whole world may be restored to the orthodox bishops who hold the Nicene faith." Here we have a really operative enactment, dealing not merely with words, but things. By the law of the previous year, the legal right to call themselves Catholics and their assemblies churches had been taken away from the heretics; but their church-buildings had been left in their hands. By the new law of January, 381, it was made obligatory on the representatives of the Emperor in the various cities to deprive the heretics of their houses of prayer, and to hand those buildings over to their Catholic rivals.

Antioch was by far the most important city in which the churches remained still in the hands of the Arians.² The Emperor therefore sent thither one of his generals, named Sapor, with a copy of his edict, and commissioned him to

¹ *Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 5, 6.

² We have seen that in Constantinople the churches were taken from the Arians soon after Theodosius' entry into the city on November 14, 380. At Alexandria the people had risen against Lucius, the Arian bishop, in the spring of 378, and had driven him from the city, the Catholics under Peter taking possession of the churches.

carry out its provisions in that capital.¹ Sapor may very probably have started from Constantinople on his journey to Antioch immediately after the publication of the law which he had to administer. If so, he would probably reach Antioch not later than the beginning of February, and he might be there a week earlier.²

Sapor had a difficult question to decide. When the Arians had been expelled by him from the Antiochene churches, three sets of claimants presented themselves before him, namely, the great Church of Antioch which recognized S. Meletius as its bishop, the Eustathians whose bishop was Paulinus, and the Apollinarians whose bishop was Vitalis. All these three bodies through their representatives declared that they accepted the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as it was held by Damasus. The scene is described by Theodoret, who, as I have already mentioned,³ was unaware of the fact that during the interval between February 28, 380, and July 30, 381, the law professed to unite Peter of Alexandria with Damasus,⁴ and to regard those two as jointly the legally authorized representatives of orthodoxy. If Theodoret had had an opportunity of studying the edict *Cunctos populos*, he would no doubt have put into the mouths of the claimants a reference to Peter as well as to Damasus. There are other points in connexion with this scene before Sapor, in regard to which it is difficult to believe that Theodoret has preserved

¹ Cf. Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 2, 3. Theodoret unfortunately confuses three different laws, namely, (1) Gratian's law of August, 378, allowing the bishops banished by Valens to return to their sees; (2) Theodosius' law, *Cunctos populos*, dated February 28, 380; and (3) Theodosius' second law, *Nullus haereticis*, dated January 10, 381. He appears also to be unaware (*H. E.*, v. 2) that in the second of these three laws Peter of Alexandria was joined with Damasus, as a legal representative of orthodoxy. There can be no doubt that Sapor's visit to Antioch was subsequent to the law of January 10, 381, and that he was sent by Theodosius, and not by Gratian.

² The distance from Constantinople to Antioch along the great Roman road was 716 English miles. An ordinary traveller, such as the Bordeaux pilgrim in 333 (cf. *P. L.*, viii. 788, 789), took forty days to cover the distance. On the other hand, in 387 Caesarius, the *magister officiorum*, hurried from Antioch to Constantinople in six days (cf. Rauschen, *Fahrbücher*, p. 265). Sapor would, of course, use the *cursus publicus*, and would have no wish to dally on the road. If he travelled at the rate of fifty-one miles a day, he would get to Antioch in a fortnight. I do not understand why Merenda asserts (*De S. Damasi Opusce. et Gest.*, cap. xii. § 1, *P. L.*, xiii. 181) that Sapor could scarcely have got to Antioch before March. I would here mention once for all that, whenever in this book I mention the distance from one place to another along the Roman roads, my statements are based on Colonel Lapie's measurements, as recorded in Fortia D'Urban's *Recueil des Itinéraires Anciens*.

³ See note 1 above.

⁴ Peter, however, died during the course of this interval, on February 14, 381. He may have been actually dead when Sapor was investigating the rival claims at Antioch; but the news of his death would hardly reach Antioch before the second week in March, and I think it probable that the investigation took place in February.

a perfectly accurate record ;¹ but we have no reason to doubt the main fact, which appears in his narrative, namely, that there was a contest between the three parties of claimants in the presence of Sapor, and that the Emperor's representative finally decided that the church-buildings in Antioch should be handed over to S. Meletius. The whole account presupposes that the three parties were out of communion with each other.

We have already seen that in the early part of the year 380 peace had not been made between the two rival sections of orthodox Christians at Antioch. The events connected with Sapor's execution of the commission confided to him, to which I have already referred, show that this state of division still continued in February, 381.² And this conclusion is corroborated by an incident that took place before the close of Sapor's investigation, to which it will be well at this point to turn our attention.

Theodoret tells us that, after much disputing had taken place in the presence of Sapor, "Meletius, who of all men was most meek, thus kindly and gently addressed Paulinus: 'The Lord of the sheep has put the care of these sheep in my hands: you have taken upon yourself (*ἀναδέδεξαι*) the charge of the rest; but the sheep themselves agree in a common orthodoxy'³ (*κοινωνεῖ δὲ ἀλλήλοις τῆς εὐσεβείας τὰ θρέμματα*). Therefore, dear friend, let us unite our flocks, and bring to an end our struggle for the place of chief command (*τὴν περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας . . . διαμάχην*); and, tending our sheep in concert, let us apply to them a common care. But if the middle seat

¹ For example, he makes S. Flavian say that Damasus, in contrast with Paulinus, "openly proclaims the Three Hypostases," whereas we know from S. Jerome's testimony (*Ep. xvii. ad Marcum*, § 2, *P. L.*, xxii. 360) that both Damasus and Peter of Alexandria used the formula of the One Hypostasis. Compare Merenda (*De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gest.*, cap. xii. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 183, 184).

² Tillemont, in his *Histoire des Empereurs* (note vii. on Theodosius I., tom. v. pp. 728, 729, edit. 1701), shows by very convincing reasons that Sapor's visit to Antioch must be placed after the promulgation of the law of January 10, 381. Gildenpenning and Ifland (*Der Kaiser Theodosius der Grosse*, p. 102, n. 27) agree with Tillemont.

³ Newman, in the Oxford translation of S. Athanasius' *Orations against the Arians* (p. 364, note b), says, "The technical sense of *εὐσέβεια* *ἀσέβεια*, pietas, impietas, for *orthodoxy*, *heterodoxy*, has been noticed" above. Compare a similar note in his *Arians of the Fourth Century* (3rd edit., 1871, p. 286), and also a note by Dr. Bright in the Oxford translation of the *Later Treatises of S. Athanasius* (p. 12). The word *εὐσέβεια* specially connoted the right belief in God. S. Meletius' flock and the Eustathians substantially agreed in their belief in the One God in Three Persons. The natural corollary seemed to be that they should coalesce so as to form one flock, and thus communicate together *in sacris*. For an instance of a similar use of the word *εὐσέβεια* by Theodoret, see his *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 6 *ad fin.*, where, giving a reason for the freedom of the West from the contamination of Arianism, he refers to the "pure orthodoxy" (*ἀκραφνῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν*) of Valentinian.

is the cause of the strife, that strife I will endeavour to get rid of. For I shall place the divine Gospel on that seat, and shall then recommend that we sit on either side. Should I be the first to pass away, you, my friend, will hold the leadership of the flock alone. Should this be your lot before it is mine, I in my turn, so far as I am able, will take care of the sheep.' These things gently and kindly spoke the divine Meletius. But Paulinus did not acquiesce. Then the general, having given judgement on what had been said, delivered the churches to the great Meletius. But Paulinus continued at the head of the sheep who originally seceded."¹ So writes the Blessed Theodoret.

Nothing could be clearer than this. Hitherto the two sections had been disunited, and a struggle had been going on between the two claimants of the episcopal throne of Antioch. Now the peace-loving S. Meletius proposes that, since there was no real doctrinal difference between the two sections, they should unite to form one flock, which should be ruled by the two bishops acting together; and further that, when either bishop died, the survivor should become sole bishop. Considering that the enormous majority of the orthodox in Antioch adhered to S. Meletius, and that he was recognized as the sole bishop by almost all the bishops of the Eastern Church outside of Egypt, the proposal was an exceedingly magnanimous one. However, Paulinus, relying on his recognition by the West and by Egypt, refused for the present Meletius' Christian offer. But he did not maintain this rigid attitude for long. Perhaps, when he heard Sapor's decision, and found that all the churches of Antioch were being handed over to his rival, he began already to regret that he had not come to terms. Soon afterwards there must have arrived from Constantinople the imperial letters convoking the second Ecumenical Council.² S. Meletius, as the recognized Bishop of Antioch, would receive a summons, but Paulinus would be left out in the cold. Anyhow, whatever Paulinus' motives may have been, it is certain that, before S. Meletius started on his journey to Constantinople, a compact of some sort was agreed upon between the two bishops. The council was to meet in May,³ and S. Meletius may be supposed to have left Antioch near the beginning of April, that is to say, very soon after Easter, which fell that year on the 28th of March. I regard it as practically certain that the compact was made at some time during February or March, 381.⁴

¹ Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 3.

² Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. ii. Mai., p. 412.

³ Cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, v. 8.

⁴ The Bollandists take a similar view. In a marginal note (*Acta SS.*, tom. iv.

It remains to investigate what the nature of the compact was. It appears to have contained at least two stipulations. Probably there may have also been a third. But, whereas we have direct evidence of what was contained in the first two clauses of the treaty, the existence and contents of the third can only be established by inference.

(1) It is quite certain that S. Meletius and Paulinus agreed together that, as far as they could bring it about, whenever either of them should be removed by death, the survivor should be regarded as sole Bishop of Antioch, and that no successor of the dead bishop should be consecrated during the lifetime of the surviving bishop.¹

(2) It was also agreed that S. Meletius should apply once more to the Western bishops to be admitted to their communion, a privilege which had hitherto been refused.² And we may feel morally sure that Paulinus promised to support S. Meletius' request; though it was no doubt provided that Paulinus should not be expected to communicate with S. Meletius, nor his followers with S. Meletius' followers, until it was ascertained that the Western bishops would be willing to grant their communion to the great body over which S. Meletius presided.³

(3) As it is obvious that S. Meletius could not possibly bind by his sole action the other bishops of the province and patriarchate⁴ of Antioch, it seems to me to be in the highest degree probable that he undertook to do what he could to obtain from his fellow-bishops, whose dioceses were situated

Jul., p. 60) they say, "Pax aliqua tandem affulget circa A.C. 381." They are speaking of peace between S. Meletius and Paulinus. The Duc de Broglie (*L'Église et l'Empire au iv^e siècle*, III. i. 424, 425, edit. 1868) in like manner holds that the compact was made after Sapor's visit and just before S. Meletius' departure for Constantinople in 381.

¹ In September, 381, the Fathers of the Council of Aquileia in their letter, *Quamlibet*, which was nominally addressed to the three Emperors Gratian, Valentinian II., and Theodosius, but was really intended for Theodosius only, wrote as follows: "We suppose that our petition has been presented to your Pieties, in which, in accordance with the compact of the parties, we have requested that on the death of either of them the rights of the Church should remain with the survivor, and that no intrusive consecration should be forcibly attempted" (*Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xii. § 5, *P. L.*, xvi. 989).

² The Fathers of Aquileia, in their letter, *Quamlibet*, quoted in the previous note, speak of the followers of S. Meletius as being "persons who have sought our communion according to the compact, which we wish should stand" (*Ep. cit.*, § 6).

³ It will be remembered how S. Basil cautiously refrained from deciding to admit the penitent Marcellians of Ancyra to his communion, until he had heard from Peter of Alexandria concerning his intentions in reference to the same set of people (compare p. 326, n. 1).

⁴ The title "patriarch" had hardly come into use; but the sixth Nicene canon shows that Antioch had for a long time possessed special privileges, such as were afterwards called "patriarchal." Cf. S. Hieron, *Lib. contra Joann. Jerosol.*, § 37, *P. L.*, xxiii. 389. See also Duchesne's *Origines du culte*, pp. 19-21.

within the circumscription, subject to the *Comes Orientis*, their formal assent to the compact.¹

We have no reason to suppose that there was any revival of the proposal that the two orthodox bodies at Antioch should be immediately merged into one, and that the two bishops should govern that one body in common. Apparently, if the compact had been finally ratified, the two bodies would have been in communion with one another, but would have retained their separate organizations until the death of one or other of the bishops. A state of things would have resulted which would not have lasted long, but which, while it did last, might be compared, as regards some of its features, with the co-existence at the present time of Latins and Uniat Orientals, living side by side in the same city, and enjoying in common the communion of the papal see, but governed respectively by their own bishops.

From the very nature of the case it is impossible to suppose that the compact could take effect at once. It needed to be ratified both in the East and in the West: in the East, because without such ratification there would be no security as to the fundamental stipulation being carried out, in case S. Meletius should die first; and in the West, because, Paulinus' adherents in the East being relatively so very few, he would compromise his whole position if he were to take any definite step without the consent of his Western allies; and, moreover, there would be a danger of those allies appointing a successor to Paulinus, in the event of his dying first, if they had not been consulted on the subject of the compact. It is to my mind out of the question to suppose that the two bodies at Antioch were brought into communion with each other by the mere fact that the two bishops had agreed to a compact, which, until it was ratified, remained in a purely inchoate condition.² Even if we could imagine that *per*

¹ S. Gregory Nazianzen tells us (*Carmen de Vita sua*, 1576-1579, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 756) that up to the moment of his death S. Meletius "recommended many things tending to agreement, which things he had previously been accustomed to pour out on his friends, and thereupon he departed to the choirs of the angels." In the immediate context, both before and after this passage, there are allusions to the Antiochene dispute, the *ὑπὲρ ὁρίων ἐπισ.* S. Meletius died at Constantinople in May or June, 381, about three months after the compact was made.

² So the Bollandist, Father Van den Bosche (*Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Jul., p. 61), declares that this compact was "non universale et numeris omnibus absolutum; sed particulare quoddam, informe, inchoatum et quasi solemnioris prodromum." On the other hand, Merenda holds that the compact was universally binding; and he tries to show (*De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gest.*, cap. xiv. § 1, et cap. xviii. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 190, 221) that when, after S. Meletius' death, an effort began to be made in the Ecumenical Council to bring about the election of S. Flavian as his successor, S. Gregory Nazianzen delivered an oration to the assembled Fathers, in which he expressed his grief that compacts made publicly and confirmed by oaths should be treated as of no account, and he thinks that S. Gregory is referring to

impossibile such was the case, it would still remain the fact that no transaction between the two bishops could of itself bring Paulinus into communion with the rest of the episcopate of the Eastern Church, nor S. Meletius into communion with the West.¹

As soon as the compact was made, steps must have been taken to get it ratified. S. Meletius certainly, and Paulinus probably, sent envoys to the West to explain the personal agreement which had been made between the two bishops at Antioch, and to request the Western bishops to accept the compact in all its parts and to admit to their communion the great Church of Antioch with its bishop at its head.

The envoys almost certainly went first to Rome.² But we hear of no council being held there in 381. The fact is that during that year the Roman Church was passing through a time of great distress, owing to the machinations of the emissaries of the anti-pope Ursinus. A false accusation of a most offensive kind had been brought against Pope Damasus.³ Later on, an investigation into the truth of this accusation was held by the Prefect of the city, Valerius Severus, who pronounced no sentence of acquittal, but sent in a report of the results of his investigation to the Emperor Gratian. A sense of insecurity pervaded the whole city.⁴ Either before or after the investigation, or perhaps both before and after, there appear to have been riots, for we read that "the blood of innocent persons was shed."⁵ The Church of Rome was almost completely deprived of the offices of religion⁶

the compact made between S. Meletius and Paulinus. Merenda is alluding to a passage in the first paragraph of S. Gregory's twenty-second Oration (S. Greg. Naz. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 414); but he mistranslates the passage (cf. cap. xviii. § 2), which has nothing to do with the compact made at Antioch, and he entirely misapprehends the occasion and purport of the twenty-second Oration, which was delivered two years before the date of the Ecumenical Council. As Dr. Rivington has adopted Merenda's theory (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 231, note), I have discussed the matter in Additional Note 74, p. 501.

¹ It will be remembered that, about a year before the compact was made, the bishops of Italy had put forth a synodical declaration, in which it was implied that S. Meletius was "alien from their communion" (see pp. 332-334). No private compact with Paulinus could undo the effect of such a declaration.

² All the other embassies from the East, as for example those sent in 365, 371, 374, 376, and 379, went to Rome, and therefore we may assume, until the contrary is proved, that the envoys in 381 went first to Rome. If any one, however, should think it more probable that S. Meletius' envoys went direct from Antioch *viâ* Sirmium to Milan, I am quite ready to waive my own opinion.

³ On the date of this conspiracy against Damasus, see the Excursus on the date of the Roman Council, which petitioned Gratian on the subject of the trial of bishops in the letter, *Et hoc gloriæ vestrae*, pp. 519-521.

⁴ Cf. *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xi. § 6, *P. L.*, xvi. 987.

⁵ Rom. Concil. *Ep. ad Gratianum et Valentinianum*, § 8, *P. L.*, xiii. 580: "sanguis innocentium funderetur."

⁶ *Ep. cit.*, "spoliaretur prope ecclesia omnibus ministeriis." Possibly the word *ministeriis* may be used for *ministris*, as the word *servitium* is used in some passages for *servi*.

(ministeria). The crisis still continued in the early part of September, when the Council of Aquileia was being held. I cannot say whether it had begun when the Antiochene envoys arrived in Rome; but it certainly must have begun soon after their visit, if not before; and when it had once begun, it would entirely prevent the possibility of holding a council in the city, so long as it lasted.¹

The envoys had no doubt been instructed to proceed from Rome to Milan, and to bring the matter of the Antiochene compact before S. Ambrose. The extraordinary influence which the see of Milan acquired during the episcopate of that great saint, had by this time made itself felt even as far as Antioch. Duchesne has shown that during the latter part of the fourth century "the episcopate of the West seems to recognize a double hegemony: that of the pope and that of the Bishop of Milan."² No doubt this influence of the see of Milan was mainly felt in the West; but it was also felt, as Duchesne points out, "in the affairs of the Eastern Church, at Antioch, at Caesarea, at Constantinople, at Thessalonica."³

To Milan, therefore, the Antiochene envoys went. If they started from Antioch as early as February 14, they might easily arrive at Milan by May 4.⁴ If their departure

¹ If pope Damasus had ratified the compact and had admitted S. Meletius to his communion on the occasion of the Antiochene envoys' visit to Rome, the news of his action would have been carried by the envoys to Milan. In that case the bishops of North Italy would surely have referred to such action when writing to Theodosius about the schism at Antioch in various letters during the course of the year. But we find no trace of any allusion to any such proceeding on the part of Damasus, either in the letter *Quantlibet* or in the letter *Sanctum animum tuum* or in any other document of authority. Moreover, if Damasus had admitted S. Meletius to the communion of the Roman Church, how do Ultramontanes account for the fact that S. Ambrose and the Fathers of Aquileia petitioned Theodosius for an ecumenical council, to be held at Alexandria, which should decide whether or no communion should be granted to S. Meletius and to his flock?

² *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 2nd edit., p. 32.

³ *Loc. cit.*

⁴ Vallarsi (*P. L.*, tom. xxii. col. l.) says that it would take at least two months for news to go from Milan to Antioch. As Antioch is 2004 English miles from Milan by the direct road *viâ* Sirmium, Constantinople, and Ancyra, that gives 33 miles *per diem* as an average rate of travelling. If S. Meletius' envoys started from Antioch on February 14, and travelled at that average rate *viâ* Constantinople, Heraclea, Aulona, Hydruntum, and Capua, they would reach Rome after a journey of 1876 miles on April 12. Allowing them ten days for their stay in Rome, and twelve more for their journey to Milan, which was 389 miles distant from Rome, they would be with S. Ambrose on May 4. As the determination of the average rate of travelling in the fourth century is a point of considerable importance, it may be well to corroborate the opinion of Vallarsi by that of other learned men. I will therefore refer to statements made by Tillemont and Stiltinck. In his life of Liberius (§ viii. n. 133, *Acta SS.*, tom. vi. Septembr., p. 602) Stiltinck, speaking of Tillemont, says, "Integrum mensem requirit, et merito, ut legati Ancyra Sirmium pervenirent." Stiltinck is no doubt referring to Tillemont's 56th note on the Ariens (vi. 774), where, however, it should be noted that by a misprint Easter is wrongly stated to have fallen on April 22 in the year 358;

from Antioch be put as late as March 3, they would at the same rate of travelling reach Milan by May 21. It is clear to me that at some date not very long after their arrival a council of the bishops of the province of Milan was held, if indeed it was not sitting when they arrived, and that that council ratified the first clause of the compact, so far as S. Ambrose and his comprovincials were concerned. It is also clear to me that the council wrote to Theodosius, begging him to use his influence, so that there should be agreement between S. Meletius and Paulinus in respect to peace and concord without violation of ecclesiastical order, or at least that, whenever one of the two Antiochene bishops should come to die, the rights of the Church should remain with the survivor, and that no attempt to carry out illegally an intrusive consecration should be permitted. As regards the request of S. Meletius to be admitted to the communion of the Western bishops, I shall show later on that the council deferred giving any answer. S. Ambrose evidently felt that it would be imprudent for him to take action in such a delicate matter (Egypt and the West being already committed to Paulinus) until he had consulted Rome and Alexandria.

In the preceding paragraph I have assumed that a provincial council of the Milanese province was held soon after the arrival of the Antiochene envoys at Milan. I proceed to justify this assumption. That the bishops of North Italy met in council at some time between the arrival of the news of the Antiochene compact in Milan and the first week in September, 381, the date of the opening of the Council of Aquileia, is clear from a passage in the letter *Quamlibet*, addressed by the Aquileian Council to Theodosius. In that letter the Fathers of the council had been speaking of the irruption of the Goths into Pannonia and Epirus in February or March, 380, and of how that irruption had prevented the execution of the plan of sending some Western bishops as arbitrators to Antioch. They go on to say, "But because the desires, which we formed at that time, failed to be accomplished owing to the troubles of the State, we suppose that our petition has been presented to your Pieties, in which, in accordance with the compact of the parties, we have requested that on the death of one [of the two bishops] the rights of the Church should remain with the survivor, and that no attempt to carry out

whereas it really fell on April 12, as Tillemont has rightly stated in another place (cf. vi. 430). The distance from Ancyra to Sirmium is 973 English miles, and if it took a month to traverse that distance, the average daily rate of travelling must have been 32 or 33 miles. This result agrees with that derived from the statement of Vallarsi.

illegally an intrusive consecration should be permitted.”¹ Now, a majority of those bishops present at the Council of Aquileia, whose sees are known, came from North Italy, the remainder coming from various provinces in different parts of the Western empire. It necessarily follows that the petition to Theodosius, to which reference is made in the above-quoted passage, must have emanated from a council, at which the bishops from North Italy were present. But having regard to the conciliar history of that epoch, we should be safe in saying that such a council would either be a general council of all Italy or of Italy and Gaul, presumably held at Rome, or else a council of the bishops of the province of Milan, presumably held at Milan. Now, there had been no council, attended by bishops from all Italy, held in Rome since the council held immediately before the Gothic irruption in the early part of the year 380. The Roman council, held at that time, had implied that S. Meletius was “alien from its communion,”² and had determined to send bishops to Antioch to try and make peace. It certainly did not ratify the Antiochene compact, which was not then in existence. The compact, as we have seen, did not come into existence until after Sapor’s mission to Antioch in January, 381. Moreover, it would not be likely that a letter written to Theodosius by Damasus and S. Ambrose in January, 380, would have been left still unanswered in September, 381. It is clear, therefore, that the petition to which the Aquileian Fathers refer was written by a council held in North Italy not many months before the Council of Aquileia. If the Antiochene envoys arrived in Milan on or before May 21, 381, the council which sent the petition to Theodosius may well have been held either in the second half of May³ or in the beginning of June in that year. In fact, the opening of the Milanese council would approximately coincide in date with the opening of the Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople, which commenced its sittings in May. A letter written by the

¹ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xii. § 5, *P. L.*, xvi. 989. “Sed quia studia nostra tunc temporis habere effectum per tumultus publicos nequiverunt, oblatas pietati vestrae opinamur preces nostras, quibus juxta partium pactum poposcimus ut altero decedente, penes superstitem Ecclesiae jura permanerent, nec aliqua superordinatio vi attentaretur.” In the first two editions of this book I adopted without sufficient consideration the faulty translation of this passage, which is to be found in the Oxford translation of S. Ambrose’s Epistles. I am indebted to Dr. Rivington for pointing out to me the mistake (see *Prim Ch.*, p. 267). The true meaning of the passage, as might be expected, fits in far better with the general setting of the history, and equally helps forward my main argument.

² See p. 332.

³ I hope to show later on that this council had to deal with another very important subject (see pp. 537, 538), and it is therefore quite possible that it was already in session when the envoys from Antioch arrived.

first-mentioned of these two councils would reach Constantinople in the middle or towards the end of the deliberations of the Second Ecumenical Council, which was taking in hand the settlement of the affairs of the Church of Antioch, and was setting aside the compact. Theodosius would not be likely to answer the North Italian letter until he could report something definite about the state of the Antiochene Church. He was still occupied by business arising out of the proceedings of the Ecumenical Council on July 30, when he published the law *Episcopis tradi*;¹ and he probably did not hear how the new bishop, S. Flavian, had been received at Antioch until the beginning of September, at the earliest.² As Milan is 1288 miles from Constantinople, it is easy to understand why no answer from Theodosius had reached S. Ambrose, when the Council of Aquileia met at the beginning of September. In point of fact, that council had received no information about any of the proceedings of the Ecumenical Council, nor had it even heard about the death of S. Meletius.

For further evidence, corroborating the conclusion that a council of the province of Milan was held towards the end of May or at the beginning of June in the year 381, the reader is referred to an *Excursus* dealing with this subject, which will be found at the end of the book.³

If we now review the relations of the two bodies of orthodox believers at Antioch to each other and to the other churches, whether in the East or West, at the end of May 381, it would appear from what has been said that an inchoate personal agreement had been made between S. Meletius and Paulinus, which needed, however, to be ratified both in the East and in the West, before it could take such effect as to bring Paulinus and the Eustathians into communion with the great majority of the Eastern bishops, and also to bring S. Meletius and the Church of Antioch into communion with Rome and the West.

We have no reason to suppose that the compact had been in any way ratified at Rome, where no synod could have been held owing to the critical state of affairs. But at Milan it was being so far ratified, that S. Ambrose and his suffragans, at the very time which we are considering, were petitioning Theodosius to use his influence to bring about an agreement between Paulinus and Meletius, "in respect to peace and concord without violation of ecclesiastical order," or, if such

¹ *Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 1, 3.

² Tillemont (x. 528) holds that S. Flavian was not consecrated until August or September, 381. See also p. 364.

³ See *Excursus II.*, pp. 529-540.

concord could not be effected, that "at least, if one of the two died before the other, no one should be put in the place of the deceased while the other lived."¹ It is clear that the compact was still a purely personal one between the two Antiochene bishops, and that their respective followings were not yet united in one communion. It remains to consider the question whether S. Meletius had been admitted to the communion of the West, so far at any rate as that could be done without the intervention of the Bishop of Rome.

On *a priori* grounds one would expect that admission to the communion of the West would not be granted until the negotiations about the compact had been brought to a happy conclusion, a result which could not be reached until the attitude of the Eastern bishops was known. And this surmise is converted into a certainty by a consideration of the words used in two passages of the letter *Quamlibet* by the Fathers of Aquileia. Those Fathers, addressing Theodosius in September, say, "We hear that [in the East] there are among the Catholics themselves frequent dissensions and warring discord; and we are disturbed in our whole state of mind, because we have ascertained that many innovations have taken place, and that persons are now being treated vexatiously who ought to have been supported, men who have always persevered in our communion."² In a word [to make our meaning perfectly clear], Timothy, Bishop of the Church of Alexandria, and Paulinus, Bishop of the Church of Antioch, who have always maintained the concord of communion with us inviolate, are said to be put in great anxiety by the dissensions of other persons, whose faith in former times was undecided.³ *We would indeed wish that these persons, if it be possible, and if they are recommended by an unmutilated faith, should be added to our fellowship (ad consortia nostra); but yet in such a way that there be preserved to those colleagues, who have enjoyed our communion from of old, their own prerogative.*"⁴

A little further on in their letter the Aquileian Fathers

¹ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xiii. § 2, *P. L.*, xvi. 990. For further remarks on this passage, see p. 537, note 2.

² This seems to refer to Sapor's judgement in favour of S. Meletius, in consequence of which the latter, and not Paulinus, was recognized by the civil power as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch.

³ In my opinion reference is here made to S. Meletius and his followers, and to them only. Timothy had recently succeeded his brother Peter in the see of Alexandria. He no doubt wrote letters to S. Ambrose, announcing his elevation. In those letters he may well have referred to the anxiety which, as occupying the most important see in the Eastern empire, he felt with regard to the Antiochene schism. I do not think that there is any allusion to a corresponding schism at Alexandria. Of such a schism I find no trace in history.

⁴ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xii. § 4, *P. L.*, xvi. 988, 989.

say, "We beg of you, most clement and Christian Princes,¹ to give orders that a council of all the Catholic bishops should be held at Alexandria, that they may more fully² discuss among themselves and define *the persons to whom communion is to be imparted*, and the persons with whom it is to be maintained."³

Nothing could be clearer than these passages. The state of "warring discord" is still going on and dividing into two camps the Eastern Christians who hold the Catholic faith. One party among these orthodox believers, the party of Paulinus, has "from of old" maintained communion with the West. The other party, that is, the party of S. Meletius, has in past times wavered in the faith—at least, that is the view taken of them by the Fathers of Aquileia. But the Aquileian Fathers are willing to admit them to their communion, if it can be shown that their faith is now full and un mutilated.⁴ However, before definite steps towards reunion are taken, they wish that an Ecumenical Council should be summoned to meet at Alexandria, in order that in a larger assembly the bishops of the whole Church may determine what persons are to be admitted to Catholic communion. Clearly, in the opinion of S. Ambrose and his brethren, S. Meletius and his followers have not yet been admitted to the communion of the West. It is perfectly impossible to suppose that a union between the Meletians and the West had already been effected and had afterwards been broken, and that nothing should be said in this letter *Quamlibet* about these events. Yet this is the astounding theory which Dr. Rivington has adopted. His notion is that S. Meletius was received into full communion by Damasus in the great council, held at Rome in 380, on the basis of a supposed compact made at the Council of Antioch in 379.⁵ He further thinks that this union was

¹ The letter is *pro forma* addressed to the two Western Emperors as well as to Theodosius.

² The expression "more fully" (*plenius*) refers to the very limited number of bishops, not more than thirty-two, who attended the Council of Aquileia. The proposed Ecumenical Council at Alexandria would, of course, be on a very much larger scale.

³ *Ep. cit.*, § 5.

⁴ The words, "si fieri potest et fides plena commendat," should be noted. If, as Dr. Rivington supposes, the Meletians had been in the communion of Rome and the West from the Roman Council of 380 until the election of S. Flavian in the summer of 381, the West must have recognized their "full" orthodoxy during that time. What, one may ask, had happened since S. Flavian's election which could possibly throw doubt on the integrity of their faith, so as to necessitate the insertion of this conditional clause?

⁵ Compare *Prim. Ch.*, pp. 250, 264. It should be noted that on p. 216 Dr. Rivington expresses the view that in 373 Damasus was "withholding express and final sanction to either party," that is, to both S. Meletius and Paulinus. On p. 250 he implies that S. Meletius was "welcomed by Rome as Bishop of Antioch in her archives" in 380. On p. 276 he says that "S. Meletius before 379" (he means before 380) was "neither excommunicated nor adopted by Rome."

broken by the election and consecration of S. Flavian to the see of Antioch as successor to S. Meletius in the summer of 381.¹ But if so, why do the Fathers of Aquileia preserve complete silence about all these supposed facts? Why do they say nothing about S. Meletius having been fully admitted to the communion of Damasus in 380, or about the death of S. Meletius, or about the election of S. Flavian and the consequent rupture of communion with the West, or about the ratification of S. Flavian's election by the Second Ecumenical Council? Those were the very points which needed to be brought out and pressed upon Theodosius' consideration. Later on in the year, when news of the Council of Constantinople had reached North Italy, such of these events as had really taken place were pressed upon the Emperor's attention by S. Ambrose and his suffragans in the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*. But at Aquileia not a word is said about them. And the reason is that the news of these events, or of such of them as had really happened, had not reached Aquileia in September;² and as regards the supposed

¹ Compare *Prim. Ch.*, p. 265, where Dr. Rivington implies that the Fathers of Aquileia were, in September, 381, petitioning for a General Council to consider "whether they should extend their communion to the followers of Meletius now placed under Flavian."

² Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 264, note 2) tries to prove that the Aquileian Fathers knew what had taken place in the Council of Constantinople by two arguments. First, he declares that "it is impossible to suppose that they would ask for a 'fuller council' at Alexandria . . . before they knew the issue of the council of Constantinople." But they had not mentioned the Council of Constantinople, and there is no reason to suppose that they knew anything about it. The word "fuller" refers, as I have already pointed out, to the relative smallness of the number of bishops gathered at Aquileia. But, secondly, Dr. Rivington argues that the Aquileian Fathers "knew of Theodosius' law of July, for they thank him for passing it, and this law was passed subsequently to the Council of Constantinople, and brings in the name of Nectarius, who was ordained at that council." Dr. Rivington is referring to a passage in the first paragraph of the letter *Quamlibet*, in which the writers thank Theodosius, because "all the churches of God, in the East especially, have been restored to the Catholics." These words evidently refer to the concluding sentence of Theodosius' law, *Nullus haereticis*, published on January 10, 381, which has been quoted above on p. 336. They perhaps refer also to the carrying out of that law at Antioch and elsewhere. Reference to a law published in January cannot prove any knowledge of a council held five or six months later. No doubt, if we had any independent proof that the Fathers of Aquileia had received intelligence of the law published on July 30 (*Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 1, 3), which renewed the final provision of the law promulgated in January, we might suppose that thanks were being given for the more recent constitution; but evidence of any knowledge of that law is completely wanting, and it is most unlikely that the bishops at Aquileia knew anything about it. In fact, when one takes account of times and distances, the probability that a copy of the law had not reached Aquileia during the sitting of the council becomes a moral certainty. This law was concerned solely with the Eastern Empire, and the probability is that weeks or even months would elapse before it would be notified to the West. But suppose that Theodosius sent a copy to Gratian on the day after its promulgation at Hadrianople, where the Emperor was sojourning. It would be sent to Milan, the city of Gratian's ordinary residence, and where, in fact, he probably was in September, 381. If

admission of S. Meletius to full communion with Damasus in 380, and the supposed rupture of communion with the Meletians on the part of the West in 381, they rest on no substantial basis of historical testimony, but are, on the contrary, inconsistent with such evidence as we have, and must be regarded as mere mistakes, and consequently reference to them, either in the letter *Quamlibet* or in the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, could not reasonably be expected.

The real truth is that there had been no reunion, and that there was no subsequent rupture. The Fathers of Aquileia bear witness that S. Meletius and his followers were not in their communion in September, 381, and the history of the negotiations between Antioch and the West shows that they never had been. As a matter of fact, though the news had not yet reached North Italy, S. Meletius had died about three months before. He died, as he had lived, outside the communion of Rome.¹ He died president of a council which the Church venerates as ecumenical.² And one may say with truth that from the day of his death the Catholic East, and from some later date the Catholic West, have honoured him as a hero of sanctity and orthodoxy. His name has been inscribed both in the East and in the West on the roll of the canonized saints.³

Before quitting the subject of S. Meletius, it will be well to gather together some of the more important facts, the truth of which seems to me to have been made plain in the course of the preceding investigation, and which throw light on the position of S. Meletius and on his relation to the Roman see.

the messenger travelled at the average speed, he might reach Milan on September 4. If we suppose that Gratian gave orders on the next day that a copy should be made and sent to S. Ambrose at Aquileia, it might reach him on the 11th or 12th of September, by which time the council had in all probability come to an end.

¹ See Additional Note 75, p. 502.

² Pope S. Gregory the Great, in a letter to the Eastern patriarchs (*Registr.*, lib. i. ep. 25, *P. L.*, lxxvii. 478), says, "I confess that I receive and venerate the four councils as I receive and venerate the four books of the Gospel"; and then the holy pope goes on to name expressly the Council of Nicaea, *the Council of Constantinople*, the first Council of Ephesus, and the Council of Chalcedon. For the main facts connected with the history of the recognition of the ecumenicity of the Second Council, see Appendix H, pp. 353-361.

³ The English Jesuit organ, *The Month* (September, 1893, p. 123), commenting on a passage included in the two earlier editions of this book, in which I expressed my belief that, "if Cardinal Wiseman's theory is true," S. Meletius "was a schismatic in life and a schismatic in death," said, "Such a conclusion, if well-founded, would unquestionably tend to show a divergence of faith between the modern and the ancient Church, for the modern Church would not regard as a saint one who lived and died in schism." For myself, I think that the ancient Church would, equally with the Church of all ages, have refused to canonize any one whom it considered to have died in schism. But the ancient Church, unlike the modern Church of Rome, did not hold the view that those who are separated from the communion of the pope are in consequence of that separation *ipso facto* in a state of schism.

I have, I hope, first of all cleared the memory of the saint from the charge of heterodoxy. It is true that until the year 363 he did not formally accept the term *ἁμοούσιον*, which he probably feared might be abused to support Marcellianism and Sabellianism. But all, or almost all, the other Eastern Catholic bishops and saints shared with him in that fear. As we have seen, S. Cyril of Jerusalem carefully avoided using the Nicene formula in his celebrated catechetical lectures. On the other hand, at the time when almost the whole episcopate, both in the East and West, signed the heretical creed of Ariminum,¹ S. Meletius seems to have been one of the few who escaped that disgrace. In the presence of the persecuting Emperor Constantius, he boldly preached the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and he never swerved in any way from maintaining the true Godhead of our Lord, though he had in consequence to go three times into banishment, and spent nearly nine years, that is to say, about half his Antiochene episcopate, in exile. After his accession to the see of Antioch, he summoned a council at the first opportunity and accepted the creed of Nicaea, and, in union with S. Basil and S. Eusebius of Samosata, helped the Catholic bishops of the East to keep true to the faith all through the weary years of the persecution under Valens. At a time when the sees of Rome and Alexandria were still granting their communion to the heretic, Marcellus, S. Meletius went so far as to refuse S. Athanasius' proffered friendship, in order to avoid even the appearance of condoning the Marcellian "blasphemy."²

As regards S. Meletius' canonical position at Antioch, he was elected by the clergy and laity of the church in that city, the greater number of whom were Catholics; and the election was canonically confirmed by the bishops of the province and patriarchate. Some of these bishops were Arianizing in belief, or, at any rate, in policy, but they were in canonical possession of their sees, and were in communion with the bishops of the Eastern Church. Others of them, such as S. Eusebius of Samosata, were Catholics. If we are to believe the witness of S. Chrysostom, S. Meletius, within three or four weeks of his inthronization, had "delivered the city from the error of heresy, and had cut off the putrefying and

¹ Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 189) says that "eventually, scarcely more than eighteen or nineteen bishops in Christendom remained uncompromised." This is an exaggeration. I could name thirty; and there were probably others, whose names have not been preserved.

² "Blasphemy" is the term applied by the Council of Chalcedon to Marcellus' doctrine (see note 4 on pp. 325, 326). The fundamentally heretical character of the Marcellian teaching has been recognized in modern times by thinkers of such different schools as Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Hefele, Dr. Gwatkin, Mgr. Duchesne, and Cardinal Newman. See pp. 480, 481.

incurable members from the rest of the body, and had brought back vigorous health to the multitude of the Church.”¹ S. Chrysostom’s testimony is confirmed by the fact that a few weeks afterwards the great majority of the Antiochene Christians broke away from all communion with the Arians, and rather than separate themselves from the fellowship of S. Meletius, were content to be deprived of the use of their church buildings, and henceforth met for worship in the fields.

Yet a small section of orthodox believers in Antioch, the Eustathians, held aloof from the saint on the ground that the great Church of Antioch, over which he presided, had, ever since the exile of S. Eustathius in 331, been compromised by the Arianizing belief of its bishops, although those bishops had never been canonically deposed, and had, in fact, for twelve years enjoyed the communion of the Roman see, and had all along enjoyed the communion of the episcopate of the East. S. Eustathius himself before leaving Antioch had urged his disciples to refrain from separating from the bishops who should be appointed to succeed him, even though they might seem to be wolves. This appeared to him to be the best course for Catholics in Antioch to take under the circumstances, so that the policy of the Eustathians had been condemned beforehand by the saint, after whose name they were called. Unfortunately their leader, Paulinus, not only refused to communicate with S. Meletius, but allowed himself to be consecrated by the fanatical Lucifer, who, in consequence of the reprobation which this irregular act called forth, broke away from the unity of the Church, and died in schism. S. Basil, S. Eusebius, and the other leaders of the Eastern Catholics, always regarded S. Meletius as the one legitimate Bishop of Antioch, and refused their communion to Paulinus as being in their judgement an intruder. Paulinus, however, had the good fortune to be recognized at Alexandria.

For many years after the Council of Sardica the Roman Church refused her communion to all the Eastern churches. In 365 she somewhat imprudently granted her communion to Eustathius of Sebaste and other Semi-Arians, including some of the least satisfactory members of that party, who soon fell away into pneumatomachianism. In 372 she began to communicate with S. Basil, but she remained separate from both parties at Antioch until 375. Then she finally made her choice, and sent letters of communion to the Eustathians, recognizing Paulinus as sole Bishop of Antioch, and making him to be in a certain sense her representative in the East. It would appear that in consequence of the calumnies of the

¹ S. Chrys. *Hom. in S. Melet.*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 519.

Eustathians she regarded S. Meletius and S. Eusebius of Samosata as "Ariomaniacs," and, looking upon them in that light, she of course kept them where they always had been, namely, outside her communion. This state of separation between S. Meletius and Rome continued on to the end, during the remaining six years which intervened between Paulinus' recognition by Rome and S. Meletius' death.¹ It had no effect on the view of S. Meletius, which was taken by the Eastern Church. Full of gratitude for his saintly life and his noble stand against Arianism, and recognizing him as the sole legitimate Bishop of Antioch, the Eastern bishops rallied round S. Meletius in a great synod at Antioch, as soon as the death of Valens put a stop to the Arian persecution of the Church. Two years later, at the Second Ecumenical Council, the Eastern bishops again rallied round the saint, who presided over it; and he died, still out of communion with Rome, not very long after the council had begun its sittings.²

APPENDIX H.

On the way in which it came to pass that the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 was finally recognized by the whole Church as an Ecumenical Council (see p. 350).

IN considering the history of the gradual recognition of the ecumenicity of the Second Council, it seems convenient to begin with the fact that the Constantinopolitan Council of the year 382, in its synodical letter, twice calls the council held in the year immediately preceding "the Ecumenical Council."³ But the council of 382, when it thus attributed ecumenicity to the council of 381, must have used the word "ecumenical" in a restricted

¹ Quite apart from the fact that S. Meletius' orthodoxy on the vital question of our Lord's co-equality and consubstantiality with the Father was doubted at Rome, he continued until his death to occupy the great see of Antioch in defiance of the pope, who recognized his rival. It was impossible for Damasus to communicate with S. Meletius until he had resigned his see, or until some compact, establishing either the joint-episcopate or the concurrent episcopate of S. Meletius and Paulinus, had been accepted and ratified by Rome. But none of these alternatives ever came to pass. There was no need for Damasus to excommunicate S. Meletius, because the latter had never been in the Roman communion, at any rate since the great rupture which followed the Council of Sardica.

² Dr. Rivington (*The Appeal to History*, p. 25) considers that "the whole case of S. Meletius suggests the 'Roman' theory of Church government as in full working order"! Comment is needless.

³ Cf. Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 9.

sense. It must have meant to say that the council of 381 was a general council of the Eastern *οἰκουμένη*, or empire.¹ For Theodosius had only summoned to that council the bishops of his own empire,² and as a matter of fact there were no representatives of the episcopate of the Western empire present at it.

But although, so far as the intention of its summoner and the limited area from which it drew its members were concerned, the council of 381 was not ecumenical in the wide sense of that term, yet from the very first it had a right to be regarded as a council of the whole Eastern Church, and its decrees were canonically binding on that church. Moreover, as at the council's request, Theodosius ratified its decrees, their canonical authority was reinforced throughout the Eastern empire by the sanction of the State. It may, however, be doubted whether, in fact, much attention was paid to these decrees in Egypt during the seventy years which intervened between 381 and the date of the Council of Chalcedon.

It was otherwise at Constantinople and at Antioch. The Bishops of Constantinople took action at once in accordance with the provisions of the third Constantinopolitan canon of 381, and placed themselves at the head of the Eastern episcopate. Nectarius, for example, in 394 presided over a synod, at which Theophilus of Alexandria and Flavian of Antioch were present. S. Chrysostom practically acted as Patriarch over the three exarchates of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace,³ although patriarchal jurisdiction was not formally given to his see until the famous 28th canon was passed by the Council of Chalcedon. We have proof that S. Proclus⁴ in particular called attention in some synodical epistle or declaration to the precedence granted to his see by the third Constantinopolitan canon. Domnus of Antioch, writing to S. Flavian of Constantinople in September or October, 448, complained bitterly of Dioscorus of Alexandria, because the latter had accused him of cowardice, on the ground that he had, "in accordance with the canons of the holy Fathers," assented to the declaration of a Constantinopolitan Council, over which "Proclus of blessed memory" had presided.⁵ Dioscorus had "reproached Domnus once and again concerning this matter, as if he had thereby betrayed the rights of the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria." In an earlier part of the same letter Domnus had narrated how Dioscorus, in an Alexandrian synod, had anathematized him as a

¹ Theodoret (*Haereticar. Fab., Compend.*, iv. 12, P. G., lxxxiii. 433) twice uses the term *ἡ οἰκουμένη* to denote the Eastern empire. Similarly S. Basil (*Ep. cxxliii. § 1, Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 373), writing to the bishops of Italy and Gaul, speaks of the Western empire as *ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς οἰκουμένη*.

² Cf. Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, v. 28.

⁴ S. Proclus' episcopate lasted from 434 to 446.

⁵ Cf. Theodoret. *Ep. lxxxvi. ad Flavianum*, P. G., lxxxiii. 1280. This letter has been usually ascribed by mistake to Theodoret. A very slight study of it will convince the reader that it has a Bishop of Antioch for its author. A Syriac translation of it has now been discovered in the library of the British Museum (Additional MS. 14530). The translation forms part of the acts of the *Latrocinium* (compare the Abbé Martin's *Pseudo-Synode d'Éphèse*, p. 115, note 4, and see the same author's *Actes du Brigandage d'Éphèse*, pp. 139-143). In this Syriac translation the letter is ascribed to Domnus, and it was read as part of the evidence against Domnus at the Robber-council.

heretic, and he calls on S. Flavian "to fight on behalf of the faith which is being attacked, and of the canons which are being trodden under foot." "For," he says, "when the blessed Fathers held a synod there in the imperial city [of Constantinople], they, acting in harmony with those who assembled at Nicaea, distinguished the patriarchates (τὰς διοικήσεις), and assigned to each patriarchate the management of its own affairs;" and then he goes on to summarize the remainder of the second canon of the Constantinopolitan Council of 381, and to show that Dioscorus had acted in manifest disobedience to its requirements; and he again begs S. Flavian to vindicate the authority of the holy canons.

But, although the canons of 381 were regarded as authoritative in the East, and although signs are not wanting that the creed, which is commonly called the Constantinopolitan creed,¹ and in all probability received some measure of sanction from the Second Council,² was regarded as a document of authority in Constantinople early in the fifth century,³ yet for all that the first written testimony which can at present be cited in favour of the council of 381 being put on a line with the great Ecumenical Councils of Nicaea and Ephesus,⁴ belongs, as we shall see, to the year 449.

There is certainly no trace of the Council of Constantinople being regarded as ecumenical by the Fathers of Ephesus (A.D. 431). Not a word was said at Ephesus either of the Council or of the creed of Constantinople; whereas the creed of Nicaea was read both in the first session and in the sixth,⁵ and frequent references to the decrees of the Nicene Council occur in the acts.

It would seem that the council of 381 was not regarded as an ecumenical assembly by the civil power in Constantinople in 448, for on February 16 in that year Theodosius the Younger addressed a law⁶ to the praetorian prefect, Hormisdas, in which the Emperor twice refers to the faith set forth at Nicaea and Ephesus, while he makes no reference to the Council of Constantinople.

Again, during the first session of the council held at Constantinople on November 8, 448, for the trial of Eutyches, under the presidency of S. Flavian, Eusebius of Dorylaeum presented a *libellus* of accusation, in which he protested that for himself he remained firm in the faith of the Fathers of Nicaea and Ephesus.⁷ And at the second session of the same council (November 12), on the invitation of S. Flavian, the bishops present made, each one, his declaration of his belief in the doctrine of the two

¹ This creed is an enlarged edition of the creed of the Church of Jerusalem. The earlier form of the creed of that church was probably enlarged by S. Cyril of Jerusalem about the year 363, and promulgated for the use of his church. Besides other emendations, six clauses, containing thirty words, and taken from the Nicene creed, were inserted into the middle of the second paragraph (compare Hort's *Two Dissertations*, pp. 94-96, 142-144).

² Compare Hort's *Two Dissertations*, pp. 97-107.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 75 and 112-115.

⁴ Yet a primacy of honour was always reserved for the council, creed, and canons of Nicaea. All subsequent ecumenical formularies were regarded as explanations of the Nicene creed.

⁵ Cf. Coleti, iii. 1008, 1201.

⁶ *Cod. Just.*, i. 1, 3.

⁷ Coleti, iv. 932.

Natures in one Person. Many of them made references to the Councils of Nicaea and Ephesus; but the council of 381 was not mentioned.¹

Not long after S. Flavian's condemnation of Eutyches in November, 448, he was requested by Theodosius to send him in writing a confession of his faith. S. Flavian did so, and it is in the letter which he sent on that occasion to the Emperor that we for the first time find the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 put on a line with the Councils of Nicaea and Ephesus. S. Flavian says in this letter that having been appointed to the ministry of the evangelical priesthood, he had been orthodox and unblamable in his belief, "always following the divine scriptures and the dogmatic formularies² of the holy Fathers who assembled at Nicaea and Constantinople, and of those who assembled at Ephesus under Cyril of holy memory, the former Bishop of Alexandria."³ The wording of this sentence may perhaps imply that the position assigned to the council and creed of Constantinople was not a new departure of Flavian's, but was traditional in the imperial city.⁴ I should not, however, wish to lay too much stress on this last inference, as it cannot be said to be free from all doubtfulness. This important document was almost certainly written at some date between November, 448, and March 30, 449;⁵ and, if one may speculate on probabilities, I should say rather late than early in that period.⁶

In the following August the Robber-council met. As it was entirely under the influence of Dioscorus of Alexandria, we might *a priori* expect that there would be no reference made by it to the Constantinopolitan Council of 381. And such, in fact, is the case. During its first session Dioscorus says that he has lying before him the decrees of Nicaea and Ephesus.⁷ And Eutyches in the *libellus*, which he presented to the council, and which contained the confession of his faith, refers more than once to the doctrine set forth at Nicaea and Ephesus;⁸ and near the end of this *libellus* he speaks of the faith which the Fathers who met at Nicaea delivered, and which the Fathers at Ephesus "*in the second council con-*

¹ Cf. Coleti, iv. 965-973. See also Theodosius' message to the council during its seventh session (Coleti, iv. 1005).

² *Ταῖς ἐκθέσεσι*. Cf. Suicer., s.v. *ἐκθεσις*.

³ Coleti, iv. 777. It is interesting to notice that at the Conference between Catholics and Monophysites, which was held at Constantinople in the year 533, the Monophysites produced a copy of this letter, from which all mention of the Council of Constantinople had been removed (cf. Coleti, v. 915). As we shall see, the Monophysites, or at any rate many of them, never admitted the ecumenicity of the Second Council.

⁴ Duchesne (*Églises Séparées*, p. 79) expresses his opinion that the creed of Constantinople was "adopté pour son usage propre par l'église de Constantinople . . . entre 381 et 451." He agrees with Dr. Hort in thinking that the so-called Constantinopolitan creed is in all probability the creed of the Church of Jerusalem, as it was edited by S. Cyril of Jerusalem.

⁵ The imperial letters convoking the Robber-council bear this date.

⁶ Time must be allowed for the intrigues of Eutyches, having for their object the winning of the Emperor over to his side, and also for the frequent efforts which the Emperor made to induce S. Flavian to be content with the definitions of Nicaea and Ephesus, and not to insist on the formula of the Two Natures (see Theodosius' letter to the Robber-council in Coleti, iv. 881).

⁷ Cf. Coleti, iv. 908.

⁸ *Ibid.*, iv. 920, 921.

firmed."¹ Similarly, the Robber-council itself, in the letter which it wrote to Theodosius at the end of its first session, declares that it had ascertained that Eutyches had introduced no innovations into the definitions of the Fathers of Nicaea and Ephesus.²

When we pass from the Robber-council to the Council of Chalcedon (October, 451), we become very soon conscious of the fact that it is no longer Alexandrine but Constantinopolitan influences that are uppermost. At the second session the imperial commissioners and the senate, in their opening speech, said to the assembled bishops, "We wish you to know" that the Emperor [that is to say, Marcian³] and ourselves "maintain the orthodox faith delivered to us by the 318,⁴ and by the 150,⁵ and by the rest of the holy and glorious Fathers."⁶ Here we find the council of 381 put on a line with the Council of Nicaea; while the Council of Ephesus is not expressly mentioned.

After this opening speech by the laymen, there follow some short speeches by various bishops, in the course of which reference is made to the Council of Nicaea and to the Council of Ephesus, but not to the council of 381.

Then the commissioners and the senate direct that the Nicene creed shall be recited. The order is carried out by the Metropolitan of Nicomedia; and the creed is received by the bishops with acclamations. When they have subsided, the commissioners and the senate direct that the Constantinopolitan creed shall be recited. The order is carried out by Aetius, the Archdeacon of Constantinople and Chief of the Notaries. Whereupon the acts inform us that "all the most reverend bishops exclaim, 'This is the belief of us all;' 'This is the belief of the orthodox;'' 'This we all believe.'"⁷ Then, at the suggestion of Aetius and by the order of the commissioners and of the senate, two letters of S. Cyril of Alexandria are read, the first of which had been received and confirmed by the First Council of Ephesus. These letters also were received with acclamations. Then S. Leo's tome was read and acclaimed; but the decision of the question whether S. Leo's tome agreed with the two creeds was postponed for five days, so as to give time for consideration.⁸

At the fourth session the commissioners and the senate request the Fathers of the council to say whether Pope Leo's tome agrees with the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds.⁹ In conformity with this request 158 Fathers, one by one, give their judgement in short speeches. They express their opinion that Leo's tome agrees with the creed of Nicaea and with the creed of Constantinople and with the exposition of the faith by S. Cyril, which was synodically sanctioned at Ephesus.¹⁰

¹ Coleti, iv. 924.

² See the Abbé Martin's *Pseudo-Synode d'Éphèse*, p. 170.

³ Theodosius had died on July 28, 450.

⁴ That is to say, by the Council of Nicaea.

⁵ That is to say, by the Constantinopolitan Council of 381.

⁶ Coleti, iv. 1205.

⁷ *Ibid.*, iv. 1212.

⁸ *Ibid.*, iv. 1240.

⁹ *Ibid.*, iv. 1361.

¹⁰ Strictly speaking, only 149 Fathers made express mention of all the three councils—that is to say, of the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus. Of the remaining nine Fathers, one omitted Nicaea; one omitted both Constantinople and Ephesus; four others omitted Constantinople; and three others

It will, I think, be obvious to every one that the general effect of these proceedings must have been to impress on the minds of the bishops assembled at Chalcedon the idea that the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 was a council which had a right to be put in the same category as the Councils of Nicaea and Ephesus. The ecumenicity of those two councils was admitted by all Catholics; and it would not be long before the Council of Constantinople would be regarded, at any rate, in the Eastern Church, as sharing in that attribute. Moreover, in its fifth and sixth sessions, the Council of Chalcedon took a further step in the same direction. It incorporated into the definition of faith, which was proposed in the fifth session and was adopted and subscribed in the sixth, the two creeds—that is to say, the creed promulgated by the Council of Nicaea, and the creed which was attributed to the Constantinopolitan Council of 381. Thus clear and unmistakable marks of the extraordinary honour which was being conferred on the Constantinopolitan Council, were stamped upon the formulary, which was the principal outcome of the Chalcedonian Fathers' labours in the domain of dogma.

It is to be noted that the Council of Chalcedon nowhere formally attributed ecumenicity to the Council of Constantinople, but the measures which it took were morally certain to result in that council being regarded as in fact ecumenical.¹ Thus what had been originally the particular view of the local Church of Constantinople became, through the action of the Fathers of Chalcedon, the generally accepted teaching of the whole Eastern Church.

Four or five months after the close of the council the Emperor Marcian issued his edict of confirmation, and in that edict he put the four Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon completely on a level.² A few years later, in response to a request from the Emperor Leo I., letters confirming the Council of Chalcedon were written by most of the metropolitans of the empire.³ In a number of these letters the same four councils are mentioned by name, and Constantinople is ranked with the other three. In the letter, written by the provincial synod of the province of Syria Secunda, the three first councils, namely, those of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus, are expressly called "*sanctae et universales synodi.*"⁴ On the other hand, certain Monophysite bishops of Egypt, writing on behalf of Timothy the Cat, in a letter to the Emperor Leo, say that they know nothing of the Council of Constantinople, and that they do not receive the Council of Chalcedon.⁵

So far we have considered what the action of the Chalcedonian Council effected *in the East* with respect to the recognition of the ecumenicity of the Council of Constantinople. We must now turn to the West. There we shall find a very different view prevailing,

omitted Ephesus. Besides the 158 Fathers who expressed their judgements separately, there were others who, at the invitation of the commissioners and to save time, signified their assent by acclamations (cf. Coleti, iv. 1396).

¹ Dr. Rivington is substantially right when he says (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 444), "The Council of Constantinople was not called 'the second synod' until after the Council of Chalcedon had placed it in that rank."

² Cf. Coleti, iv. 1785.

³ *Ibid.*, iv. 1835-1934. These letters must have been written in 457 or 458.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iv. 1864.

⁵ *Ibid.*, iv. 1849.

In two different letters S. Leo speaks depreciatingly of the Second Council, describing its third canon as "a document drawn up by *certain bishops*,"¹ and denying that "the agreement of *certain bishops*"² could abrogate the decrees of Nicaea. In October, 485, a Roman Council, held under the authority of Pope Felix III., in a letter to the anti-Acacian presbyters and archimandrites in Constantinople and Bithynia, assures them that it "upholds the venerable synods of Nicaea, Ephesus (the first), and Chalcedon";³ but it says nothing about the Constantinopolitan Council of 381. Similarly, Pope Gelasius (492-496) in his decree, *De libris recipiendis*, in which he gives a list of the Ecumenical Councils, mentions only three such councils, namely, those of Nicaea, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.⁴ On the whole it appears evident that the action of the Council of Chalcedon, which produced so great an effect in the East in leading the Church to recognize the ecumenicity of the Second Council, produced no similar effect on the West, at any rate during the fifth century.⁵

In 484 began the long schism resulting from the excommunication of Acacius, which broke the communion between East and West. We have every reason to suppose that during the whole period of the schism the Eastern Catholics continued to regard the Ecumenical Councils as four in number. As we have seen, they recognized four before the schism began, and we find them still recognizing four in the year 518,⁶ which was the last complete year before the breach between Rome and Constantinople was healed.

As regards the West, we have no reason to think that either Pope Anastasius II. (496-498) or Pope Symmachus (498-514) receded from the position taken up by Felix III. and Gelasius. But there is good ground for believing that at some time during the first five years of the episcopate of Pope Hormisdas, the ecumenicity of the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 was by synodical enactment recognized at Rome.

Hormisdas became Bishop of Rome in July, 514. Two years afterwards, in 516, a considerable number of the bishops of Eastern Illyricum, who had hitherto taken sides with Constantinople in the long quarrel, petitioned Hormisdas for admission to the communion of Rome. The

¹ S. Leon. *Ep. cvi. ad Anatolium*, cap 5, *P. L.*, liv. 1005, 1007.

² *Ibid.*, *Ep. cv. ad Pulcheriam*, cap. 2, *P. L.*, liv. 1000.

³ Coleti, v. 248.

⁴ Cf. Ballerin., *De Antiq. Collection. et Collector.*, pars ii. cap. i. § 2, n. 7, et pars ii. cap. xi. § 5, n. 10, *P. L.*, lvi. 67, 68 et 178; and see Hefele (*E. tr.*, ii. 373, 374).

⁵ Yet in Eastern Illyricum, which ecclesiastically remained part of the West, though politically it belonged to the Eastern empire, we find references to the Four Councils as early as 457 or 458 (compare Coleti, iv. 1920, 1928, 1929).

⁶ In the year 518, while the schism was still going on, the Four Councils were mentioned with honour by John of Jerusalem and the council of the three Palestines in a synodical letter addressed to John of Constantinople (cf. Coleti, v. 1161), also by the Council of Tyre (Coleti, v. 1172), also by a Council of Constantinople in a report presented to the Patriarch John (Coleti, v. 1133, 1136, compare 1141). Finally, on the day of the great acclamations (see p. 397), the Four Councils were, by order of the Patriarch, solemnly preconized at the reading of the diptychs in the great church at Constantinople (Coleti, v. 1156, 1157).

letters written on this occasion by the provincial synod of Epirus Vetus and by its president, John, Metropolitan of Nicopolis, have been preserved. In his letter the Metropolitan John makes profession of his desire to agree in all things with Hormisdas, and he mentions with special honour the four Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.¹ Hormisdas, in his reply, commends John and his brethren for their desire to become once more "sharers in the inheritance of the Fathers," and he makes no adverse comment on John's treatment of the Council of Constantinople.² It is clear, therefore, that as early as the year 516, the Roman Church, when receiving a whole province to its communion, was willing to allow it to make an open profession of its acceptance of the council of 381 as an Ecumenical Council. If Hormisdas had not already recognized the ecumenicity of the Council of Constantinople, the question was at any rate now fairly brought before him, and in view of the future reunion of the whole Eastern Church, for which he was labouring, he must have been carefully considering what line he ought to take in regard to this matter.

After the death of the Emperor Anastasius in July, 518, the cause of reunion made rapid progress. The Patriarch John of Constantinople sent to the pope in September of that year a preliminary confession of faith, in which he proclaimed his acceptance of the Four Councils.³ Hormisdas, in his reply, written in January, 519, says, "Dilectionis tuae confessionem gratanter accepimus, *per quam sanctae synodi comprobantur.*"⁴ I can hardly think that Hormisdas would have written such words in answer to such a letter if he had not already, on behalf of his church, accepted all the Four Councils as ecumenical. In fact, he must have done so. For the five legates who carried this letter to Constantinople, writing five months later to the pope, told him that, in reply to certain Scythian monks, they had, both in the presence of the Emperor and also in the presence of the senate, spoken as follows: "*Extra synodos quattuor, extra epistolas papae Leonis, nec dicimus nec admittimus; quidquid non continetur in praedictis synodis, aut quod non est scriptum a papa Leone non suscipimus.*"⁵ And the legate-deacon, Dioscorus, addressed later on to the pope a *Suggestio*, dated October 15, 519, in which he described a meeting held at the house of the Patriarch John; and he mentioned that in the course of the proceedings at this meeting, the legates said, "Quod non est *in quattuor conciliis* definitum, nec in epistolis beati papae Leonis, nos nec dicere possumus nec addere."⁶ It is quite inconceivable that papal legates writing to the pope should speak of "the Four Councils" in this way, if at that time Rome only recognized Three Councils. To me it seems perfectly evident that the ecumenicity of the Second Council was recognized at Rome by Hormisdas, no doubt in a synod, some time between his accession in July, 514, and his sending the five legates in January, 519.

¹ Cf. *P. L.*, lxiii. 387.

² Cf. Hormisd. *Ep.* vii. *ad Joannem*, *P. L.*, lxiii. 388, 389.

³ Cf. *P. L.*, lxiii. 429.

⁴ *P. L.*, lxiii. 430.

⁵ *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* 217, ed. Günther, p. 678, et *P. L.*, lxiii. 474.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Ep.* 224, ed. Günther, p. 686, et *P. L.*, lxiii. 478.

This conclusion may be confirmed by an independent argument. We have good evidence for believing that Hormisdas republished Gelasius' decree, *De libris recipiendis*, with additions and modifications, and that one of the changes which he made was the insertion of the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 into the list of the General Councils.¹

Thus it came to pass that on this very important point Rome gave way to the East, and more especially to Constantinople; and from the time of Hormisdas onward she has venerated with supreme honour, as she venerates the books of the Gospel, a council,² the first president of which lived and died out of her communion. It does not look as if the early Church regarded membership in the Catholic body as being dependent on communion with Rome.

¹ Cf. Ballerin., *De Antiq. Collection. et Collector. Canonum*, pars ii. cap. xi. § 5, n. 10, *P. L.*, lvi. 178. See also the *Admonitio* of Dom Coustant, published by Andreas Thiel in his *De Decretali Gelasii Papae* (ed. 1866, pp. 2-14). Thiel himself agrees with the Ballerini and with Coustant in their view that the Gelasian decree was modified by Hormisdas, and that it was he who introduced into it the mention of the Council of Constantinople. I find myself quite unable to follow Duchesne and Mommsen, who hold that it was not until the pontificate of Vigilius (537-555) that the ecumenicity of the Second Council was recognized at Rome (cf. *Lib. Pontif.*, ed. Duchesne, *Introduction*, p. xxxviii., et *Lib. Pontif.*, ed. Mommsen, *Prolegom.*, p. xxi.). Such a view is, I think, sufficiently disproved by the considerations set forth in the text, but out of respect for the surpassing authority of the two great critics, from whom I have the misfortune to differ, I will add here one more argument, which seems to me to be destructive of their theory. Pope John II. in his letter, *Olim quidem*, addressed to certain senators, which was written in the year 534, says, "Tomum vero papae Leonis, omnesque epistolas, necnon et quatuor synodos, Nicaenam, et Constantinopolitanam, et Ephesinam primam, et Chalcedonensem, sicut Romana hactenus suscepit et veneratur ecclesia, sequimur, amplectimur atque servamus" (Mansi, viii. 806, et *P. L.*, lxvi. 23).

² Among all the councils which are regarded as ecumenical, both by the Easterns and by the Latins, the Second Council is the only one which was not summoned as an Ecumenical Council. The attribute of ecumenicity was not simply confirmed to it, but rather was conferred upon it by the after-action of the Church. Fundamentally, that after-action was taken at the Council of Chalcedon; but the effect of the council's action in respect of this matter was recognized more tardily in the West than in the East. Finally, however, the West submitted itself, and thenceforth the ecumenicity of the Second Council has been unanimously recognized by Catholics.

LECTURE XI.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH TO THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.—V.

The episcopate of S. Flavian.

AS we have seen, S. Meletius died either in May or June, 381, before his personal compact with Paulinus had been accepted and ratified by the bishops, either of East or West. The Ecumenical Council was sitting and had to take into consideration the needs of the Antiochene Church, the primatial Church of the *Oriens*. Neither the council nor the bishops of the patriarchate and province of Antioch were in any way bound by the compact. They could not be bound in such a matter by the personal action of S. Meletius and Paulinus. It was their duty to take into consideration the whole situation, and to decide whether they would recognize Paulinus as Bishop of Antioch, or direct that S. Meletius' throne should be filled in the regular way. Arguments were not wanting in favour of either alternative. In favour of the recognition of Paulinus the main argument would be the prospect of immediate peace, internal peace at Antioch between the two rival sections, and peace between East and West, which would be strengthened by the acceptance of Paulinus, whereas it would be imperilled by the election and consecration of a new bishop. On the other hand, from the point of view of the bishops assembled at Constantinople, the Eastern Church, to whom it belonged to settle the matter, had long ago decided that Paulinus was a schismatical intruder, and it would seem a strange thing, involving in the future a loosening of the bonds of all discipline, if the members of the Catholic hierarchy of the East were to set over the great patriarchate of Antioch "the head of a little sect,"¹ who for nineteen years had been defying their authority. And as for peace with the West, that no doubt was a very desirable thing, but it would be best brought

¹ I use the Duc de Broglie's expression (see *L'Église et l'Empire au iv^e siècle*, III. i. 429, edit. 1868).

about by the West humbling itself for its unfraternal action in the past, and ceasing in the future to disturb the East by first listening to the calumnies of schismatics¹ and then supporting them in their rebellion against their legitimate superiors. After much debating the council decided that the compact should not be ratified, and that a successor to S. Meletius should be elected and consecrated.² I confess that I do not see how it could have acted otherwise without betraying the dignity of the Church and very seriously imperilling its discipline. It was one thing for a humble person, like S. Meletius, to be willing to sacrifice his own rights, if the Church should permit him to do so; it was another thing for the bishops of the East, assembled in a great council of the East, to sacrifice the rights and dignity and discipline of the Church, and to enthrone with acclamation in one of the great primatial chairs of Christendom one whom they regarded as an obstinate rebel. Even if the West should raise difficulties, no permanent effect was likely to result from its opposition. Paulinus was a very old man, and must in the nature of things soon pass away; and then the West would have to come to terms. It would have no means of keeping up the schism, even if it should wish to do so. As far as man could judge, the ultimate victory of right and order was secure; and so the event proved. After some

¹ I do not doubt that the lying stories put about by the Eustathians concerning S. Meletius, some of which, one is sorry to say, are retailed by S. Jerome, and the wrongness of which is candidly admitted by Baronius, the Bollandists, the Benedictines, Montfaucon, Maran, and Toutté, the Jesuit Zaccaria, and others, had something to do with making the Fathers of the Second Council feel that Paulinus was an impossible person to be chosen as a successor to the glorious saint whom his followers, if not himself, had persistently maligned.

² Theodoret says (*H. E.*, v. 23), "the choir of the bishops resisted" the wish of Paulinus to succeed to the bishopric. Tillemont (x. 138) says, "Tout le corps du concile qui passe aujourd'hui pour le second oecumenique ordonna qu'on donneroit un successeur à S. Mélece." De Broglie (*III. i. 430*) says, "Seul Grégoire . . . ne partagea pas la répugnance commune." De Broglie is speaking of the general repugnance to Paulinus becoming the successor of S. Meletius. It is quite probable that S. Gregory had learnt from S. Jerome to appreciate the good points in Paulinus' character. He certainly did his best to secure Paulinus' succession. His efforts were well meant, but they were bound to fail, and it was better for the Church that they should fail. The fact is that S. Gregory was a saint, a theologian, and a preacher, but not a leader of men. Mgr. Batiffol (*Ancienne Littérature Chrétienne Grecque*, p. 238) has given the following just description of him:—"Inférieur à Grégoire de Nysse comme homme de pensée, inférieur à Basile comme homme d'action, il est un homme de sentiment, pathétique, inconstant, attachant malgré tout." Notwithstanding my deliberate opinion that, in S. Gregory's dispute with the council about appointing a successor to S. Meletius, the council was right and S. Gregory was wrong, I am quite ready to subscribe to Dr. Hort's judgement that in this transaction "it was easy for good and high-minded men to take different sides at the time" (*Two Dissertations*, p. 98, note 1). Whatever view be taken of the wisdom of the council's decision, there can be no question that their action was canonically legitimate, and therefore my general argument is entirely unaffected by the different judgements which may be passed on the expediency of their proceedings.

years of tension and discord the West fell into line, and the schism was healed.

The priest who was actually elected to succeed S. Meletius was S. Flavian. He was born and had been brought up in Antioch, and had been present when S. Eustathius, just before his banishment in 331, had urged the Antiochene Catholics to remain steadfast in their allegiance to the great Church of Antioch, whatever wolves in the guise of bishops might be appointed to preside over that church.¹ Even before his ordination S. Flavian had worked assiduously with the view of encouraging the Catholics in Antioch to remain true to the faith. He was ordained priest by S. Meletius, and during the later years of that saint's exile S. Flavian acted as his representative. He was now more than seventy years old, and was in every way qualified to be S. Meletius' successor in the see.² He seems to have been consecrated at Antioch a few weeks after the conclusion of the Ecumenical Council.³

S. Chrysostom describes how the sorrow of the faithful at the death of Meletius was changed into joy by the consecration of Flavian. It seemed to them that Meletius had risen from the tomb, and in the person of Flavian was seated once more in the pontifical chair.⁴ Flavian was acknowledged as the true bishop by all the suffragans of the Antiochene province and patriarchate, and also by the episcopate of the three exarchates of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. But Egypt, the province of Bostra in Arabia, Cyprus, and the West recognized Paulinus. In the summer of the year 382, the majority of the bishops who had attended the second Ecumenical Council met again in synod at Constantinople, and addressed a synodical letter to the Western bishops, who were about to hold a council at Rome. Theodoret gives the letter at full length, in proof, as he says, of the manly spirit and wisdom of the bishops.⁵ In the course of their letter they inform their Western brethren⁶ that the bishops of the province of Antioch and of the patriarchate of the East⁷ "have *canonically* consecrated the most reverend and most God-beloved Flavian to be bishop of the very ancient and

¹ Cf. S. Chrys. *Hom. in S. Eustath.*, § 4, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 609.

² On the legendary story which attributes perjury to S. Flavian, see the Additional Note 76, p. 503.

³ On the place and date of S. Flavian's consecration, see the Additional Note 77, p. 505.

⁴ S. Chrys. *Serm. cum Presb. fuit ordin.*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 442.

⁵ Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 8.

⁶ The letter is addressed "to the very honoured lords and most reverend brethren and fellow-ministers, Damasus, Ambrose, Britonius, Valerian," etc.

⁷ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως. The Constantinopolitan Fathers add that the whole of the local Church of Antioch was consenting to Flavian's ordination, and as it were with one voice gave him honour.

truly apostolical Church of Antioch.”¹ But the Western bishops in their council at Rome took a different view of the matter. They had always supported Paulinus, and they continued to support him now. Sozomen tells us that “the bishop of the Romans and all the priests (*i.e.* bishops) of the West were not a little indignant; and they wrote the customary synodical epistles to Paulinus, as Bishop of Antioch, but they entered into no communication with Flavian; and they treated Diodorus of Tarsus and Acacius of Beroea, and those who acted with them,² the consecrators of Flavian, as guilty persons, and they held them to be excommunicate.”³

Thus the old state of things went on. The orthodox of Antioch continued to be divided into two camps, as they had been divided ever since the banishment of S. Eustathius in 331. The great majority acknowledged S. Flavian as the true bishop, and he enjoyed the communion of the Catholic bishops throughout the Eastern empire, with the exception of those whose sees were situated in Egypt, Cyprus, and Arabia. The small body of the Eustathians still clung to Paulinus, who was recognized by Rome and the West. Of course, if the theories of the Vatican Council and of Cardinal Wiseman are true, S. Flavian and Diodorus and Acacius were excommunicated schismatics, and the Eastern bishops, who supported them and communicated with them, were *fautores schismaticorum*. However, the blessing of God seemed to rest upon them. It was at Antioch, in the midst of this nest of so-called schismatics, that S. Chrysostom was growing day by day in sanctity, and was becoming famous for the eloquence and unction and fruitfulness of his preaching. As may be supposed, when the fact that he was a great Eastern saint and doctor is remembered, he took no heed of the papal pronouncement against S. Flavian. Antioch was an Eastern see, and the Eastern bishops had sanctioned Flavian’s consecration, and had determined that it was canonical, as in fact it was. In such a matter it was for the Eastern bishops to judge; and S. Chrysostom, being well versed in the Church’s laws, threw himself heart and soul into S. Flavian’s cause. His whole life had hitherto been spent out of communion

¹ Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 9.

² τοὺς ἀμφὶ Διοδώρον . . . καὶ Ἀκάκιον.

³ Sozom. *H. E.*, vii. 11. The excommunication seems to have extended to the bishops of the province and patriarchate of Antioch, who joined, as a body, in the consecration of S. Flavian. The new bishop himself, as having been a priest under S. Meletius, had never been in the communion of the West since the disruption which followed the Council of Sardica. There was, therefore, no need to excommunicate him by name. He remained where he was, namely, outside the communion of Rome and the West.

with Rome. In A.D. 369, when he was about twenty-two years old, he had been baptized by the great S. Meletius, and in the following year had been admitted by him into the minor order of readers. In 381, S. Meletius, just before leaving Antioch for the last time, had raised S. Chrysostom to the diaconate, and five years afterwards, early in the year 386, the saint was ordained priest by S. Flavian. It was not until twelve years later that S. Chrysostom, after his elevation to the episcopal throne of Constantinople, entered into communion with the see of Rome. He was then fifty-one or perhaps fifty-four years old, and the main bulk of his homilies and commentaries had been by that time written. When we are reading any of S. Chrysostom's works, or when they are being quoted controversially either on the one side or the other, it is desirable that we should remember that in the majority of cases what is being read or quoted was written by him at a time when, according to Cardinal Wiseman's theory, he was living in schism. The mere statement of such an absurd consequence appears to me to constitute in itself a disproof of the theory which logically leads to it.

I said that S. Chrysostom threw himself heart and soul into S. Flavian's cause. In many of his sermons he gives expression to the feelings of veneration and affection which he entertained for his saintly bishop and leader. On one occasion, after quoting the great promise to S. Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," he says that the apostle inherited the name of Peter, "not because he did miracles, but because he said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'" "Thou seest," he continues, "that his very being called Peter took its beginning, not from working miracles, but from ardent zeal. But, since I have mentioned Peter, another Peter occurs to me, our common father and teacher, who, being his successor in virtue, has also inherited his see. For this too is one of the privileges of our city, that it received at the beginning for its teacher the first of the apostles."¹ Thus did S. Chrysostom regard S.

¹ S. Chrys. *Hom. in Inscript. Act.* ii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 70. S. Chrysostom goes on to mention that, while Antioch had yielded up S. Peter's body to the imperial city of Rome, she had nevertheless kept S. Peter himself, because she kept S. Peter's faith. I think that it is quite possible that S. Chrysostom, in the ardour of his love and veneration for the apostolic founder of the Church of Antioch, may have been betrayed sometimes into an exaggerated tone, when speaking of S. Peter (but see Appendix I, pp. 372-375). It is, however, to be noted that he never connects the Petrine primacy with any supposed primacy of jurisdiction in the see of Rome. As has been mentioned already, he was, during the greater part of his life, out of communion with the see of Rome, and consequently he would not be likely to magnify the Roman claims. But he had a great devotion to S. Peter, and it is conceivable that in his homilies, when he is giving expression to that devotion, his fervid rhetoric may have carried him beyond the strict limits of accurate statement.

Flavian, though living in separation from the communion of Rome, as "another Peter," the successor of the apostle in virtue, as he was also, according to the belief of that age, Peter's successor in the episcopal throne of Antioch. In another homily he speaks of S. Flavian as his "tenderly loving father."¹ In another, preached when the bishop was not present, he speaks of his "fervent, fiery, warm charity, which could not be restrained."² But such passages are too numerous to quote, and would become wearisome.

The Eustathian Bishop Paulinus seems to have died in A.D. 389.³ Before his death he consecrated Evagrius to be his successor. This act involved a most serious breach of the canons. The consecration took place without the consent of the bishops of the province and patriarchate. It was performed with no assisting bishops; and, moreover, it was the case of a bishop consecrating his own successor, a proceeding which the Church has always forbidden. The fact was that towards the end of Paulinus' episcopate no single bishop in the patriarchate of the East supported him or communicated with him. The Western Council of Capua, held during the winter of 391-392, granted the communion of the West to all orthodox bishops of the East, with the exception of the rival bishops at Antioch, S. Flavian and Evagrius. The council committed to Theophilus of Alexandria and to the other Egyptian bishops the duty of arbitrating between these two. S. Flavian, however, very naturally declined to commit his cause, which had been canonically decided in his favour by his proper judges, the bishops of the East, to the arbitrament of the Egyptians, who had for years been communicating with the schismatic Eustathians, and had thus been fomenting division in his city and diocese. As it happened, the situation was, not many years afterwards, simplified by the death of

¹ τῷ πατρὶ φιλοστόργῳ. *Hom. in illud In Fac. Petr. Rest., Opp.*, ii. 362.

² *Hom. i. de Incomprehensib., Opp.*, i. 445.

³ Paulinus' death is sometimes assigned to the year 388, but that date appears to be too early. Socrates (*H. E.*, v. 15) and Sozomen (*H. E.*, vii. 15) imply that he died about the time when Theodosius celebrated his victory over Maximus by a triumph at Rome. That triumph took place in June, 389. With regard to Paulinus, I notice that Mr. Richardson (*What are the Catholic Claims?* p. 117) entitles him "Saint Paulinus." I very much doubt whether he could produce any proof of the Church having ever commemorated him as a saint. The two Catholic bishops of Antioch, S. Meletius and S. Flavian, were canonized; but the Eustathian leaders, Paulinus and Evagrius, never attained to that honour. It is true that S. Flavian, with great wisdom and magnanimity, inserted their names in the diptychs, but that is a very different thing from canonizing them (compare note 2 on p. 424). S. Atticus, in a letter to S. Cyril of Alexandria, mentions that "Paulinus and Evagrius, who were leaders of the schism in the Church of Antioch, were inscribed after their death in the sacred diptychs with a view to the peace and concord of the people" (*Opp.* S. Cyril. Alex., ed. Aubert, vi. 203). The name of Paulinus of Antioch does not appear in the Roman Martyrology.

Evagrius. The great influence of S. Flavian prevented any bishop being appointed to carry on the Eustathian succession, and so at last a real prospect of peace dawned upon the Christian people of Antioch.

But before I speak of the healing of the breach, it seems desirable that I should try and throw light on the view which S. Chrysostom took of the Eustathian position, while the bishop, Evagrius, was still alive. In one of his homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians,¹ the great preacher warns his flock most earnestly against the dreadful sin of leaving the true Church of Antioch in order to "go over," if I may use a colloquialism, to the Eustathian body. That body, it will be remembered, had been in communion with the Roman Church from 375 to the winter of 391-2, the date of the Council of Capua; and I shall hope to show that the Eustathians had most probably recovered the communion of Rome before the time when the homily, to which I allude, was preached.²

But the interest of that homily does not, for the most part, depend on the question whether at the precise moment of its delivery Siricius of Rome and "Pope Evagrius" of Antioch, as S. Jerome calls him, were united in the bonds of ecclesiastical fellowship. S. Chrysostom treats the Eustathians as schismatics, because their ecclesiastical status was vitiated by the unlawful consecrations of Paulinus by Lucifer and of Evagrius by Paulinus. The uncanonical character of those consecrations had been condoned at Rome in 375 and 389; but S. Chrysostom, when warning the Catholics of Antioch against the sin of joining the Eustathians, makes no allusion of any sort or kind to the action of Rome either for or against the separatist body. It is clear that in S. Chrysostom's mind the question, as to whether the Eustathians were schismatics or not, was in no way settled by their relation to Rome. The arguments, which he uses, prove that in his view they had been schismatics ever since Paulinus was intruded by Lucifer into a see which was already canonically and worthily occupied by S. Meletius. In other words, they were schismatics during the sixteen years when they were undoubtedly in full communion with the pope; they remained schismatics when, after the Council of Capua, Siricius withdrew from them his countenance; and they were still schismatics when the homily was preached, although in the meanwhile they had probably been restored to fellowship with the Roman

¹ On the date of S. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians, see the Additional Note 78, p. 506.

² On the date of the death of Evagrius, and on the question whether he was in communion with Rome, when S. Chrysostom preached his eleventh homily on the Epistle to the Ephesians, see the Additional Note 79, p. 506.

see. But it is time to quote S. Chrysostom's words. In his eleventh Homily on the epistle to the Ephesians, he says, "If we desire to partake of that Spirit which is from the Head, let us cleave one to another. . . . Nothing will so avail to divide the Church as love of authority. Nothing so provokes God's anger as the division of the Church. . . . When the Church is warred upon by her own children, it disgraces her even in the face of her enemies. For it seems to them a great mark of hypocrisy that those who have been born in her, and nurtured in her bosom, and have learned perfectly her secrets, that these should of a sudden change, and treat her as an enemy. Let these remarks be taken as addressed to those who give themselves indiscriminately to those who divide the Church. For if, on the one hand, those persons have doctrines also contrary to ours,¹ then on that account further it is not right to mix with them; if, on the other hand, they hold the same opinions, the reason for not mixing with them is greater still. And why so? Because then the disease is from lust of authority. . . . Shall it be said, 'Their faith is the same; they are orthodox as well as we'? If so, why then are they not with us? There is 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism.' If their cause is right, then is ours wrong; if ours is right, then is theirs wrong. . . . Dost thou think this is enough, tell me, to say that they are orthodox? Are then things connected with the ordination of the clergy past and done away?² And what is the advantage of all things else, if this be not strictly observed? For as we must needs contend for the faith, so must we for this also. . . . How shall we bear the ridicule of the heathen? For if they reproach us on account of our heresies, what will they not say of these things? 'If the doctrines are the same, if the mysteries are the same, why does one of the two rulers invade the other church? (τίνος ἔνεκεν ἕτερος ἄρχων ἑτέρα ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιπηδᾷ;) See ye,' say they, 'how all things amongst the Christians are full of vain-glory.' . . . If any amongst us are convicted of deeds the most disgraceful, and are about to undergo some penance, great is the alarm, great is the fear on all sides, lest he should start away, people say, and join the other side. Yea, let such an

¹ S. Chrysostom is doubtless referring to the disputes about the use of the word *hypostasis*, in connexion with the doctrine of the Holy Trinity (see note 1 on p. 314).

² τὰ τῆς χειροτονίας. There is obviously a reference to the uncanonical consecration of Paulinus by the firebrand Lucifer, when the see of Antioch was already occupied by S. Meletius (see p. 159), and also to the entirely uncanonical act by which before his death Paulinus consecrated, without any assisting bishops, Evagrius to be his successor, as bishop of the Eustathians.

one start away ten thousand times, and let him join them. And I speak not only of those who have sinned, but if there be any one free from imputation, and he has a mind to depart, let him depart. I am grieved indeed at it, and bewail and lament it, and am cut to the very heart, as though I were being deprived of one of my limbs; and yet I am not so grieved as to be compelled to do anything wrong through such fear as this. . . . I assert and protest that to make a schism in the Church is no less an evil than to fall into heresy. . . . Of what hell shall he not be worthy, who slays Christ and plucks Him limb from limb? . . . Speak, ye women that are present—for this generally is a failing of women—relate to the women that are absent what I have mentioned, startle them. . . . Those who, forsooth, seem to be in earnest, these are the very persons who work this mischief. Yet surely, if it is for these things ye are in earnest, it were better that ye also were in the ranks of the indifferent; or rather it were better still that neither they should be indifferent, nor ye such as ye are. I speak not of you that are present, but of those who are going over. The act is adultery. . . . One of the two [sets of clergy] must have been appointed contrary to law.¹ If, therefore, you suspect [the rightfulness of our position], we are ready to yield up the government to any one you like. Only let the Church be one. But if we have been lawfully appointed, persuade those to resign who have illegally mounted the throne. . . . Be earnest, I entreat you, in establishing yourselves firmly henceforward, and in bringing back those who have seceded, that we may with one accord lift up thanksgiving to God.”²

If there are any English Churchmen who are tempted to “go over” to the Anglo-Roman body, it might be well for them to read carefully the whole of the preceding extract. The forcible reasoning, which S. Chrysostom employed against the Romanizers of his day, is entirely applicable to their representatives in the present generation. There is, no doubt,

¹ This sentence shows that S. Chrysostom’s main objection to the Eustathian position was the unlawfulness of the consecration of Paulinus, rather than the additional irregularities which made the consecration of Evagrius still more uncanonical than it would have been if he had merely inherited Paulinus’ status. The irregularities which were peculiar to Evagrius were independent of the canonical position of S. Flavian; but the irregularities which were common to both Paulinus and Evagrius would only be regarded as irregularities by those who recognized the canonicity of the status of S. Meletius and S. Flavian.

² S. Chrys. *Hom.* xi. in *Epist. ad Ephes.*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., xi. 86–89. In the Benedictine preface to the Homilies on the Ephesians, Dom Montfaucon shows clearly that they were preached at Antioch, and he draws his primary argument from this very passage; concerning which he says, “Omnino loqui videtur de schismate Eustathiano, tunc Antiochiæ perseverante.” The preface to the Oxford translation gives a summary of Montfaucon’s other arguments. Compare also Tillemont, xi. 628, 629.

one great difference in the situation. In those days, the days of Pope Siricius, the papal idea was only the germ of a germ. It was not completed as a germ until the time of S. Leo and his immediate successors. Now the Leonine germ has reached an enormous development,¹ and will no doubt develop much more as time goes on. The Eustathians themselves would have been amazed if they could have foreseen the future.

I have already said that after the death of Evagrius no bishop was appointed to carry on the Eustathian succession. However, the Eustathians still kept up their separate assemblies for worship under the leadership of their presbyters. It was not until 398, after S. Chrysostom's consecration to the bishopric of Constantinople, that the long breach between Rome and Antioch was brought to an end. This happy result was effected by the mediation of S. Chrysostom.

The Emperor Arcadius, the son and successor of Theodosius, had summoned Theophilus of Alexandria to Constantinople, to take part in S. Chrysostom's consecration, and Theophilus was in fact his principal consecrator. In this way it came to pass that S. Chrysostom, for the first time in his life, was admitted to the communion of the see of Alexandria. It was also at this time of his consecration that he negotiated the reunion of Theophilus with S. Flavian.² Thus the three great sees of Constantinople,³ Alexandria, and Antioch entered into a league of peace with each other. It only remained to bring Rome and the West into the confederation, and then the complete visibility of the Church's unity, which had been so long in abeyance, would be once more restored. Accordingly Acacius, Bishop of Beroea, one of S. Flavian's consecrators, was sent to Rome by S. Chrysostom, and S. Isidore, a priest of Alexandria, was sent with him by Theophilus. Acacius carried with him the decree of S. Chrysostom's election to the episcopal throne of Constantinople, and the two legates, who travelled together, took to the pope documentary proof of the fact that S. Flavian was in full communion with Theophilus.⁴ Pope Siricius seems to have made no difficulty about receiving S. Flavian and S. Chrysostom to his communion. There is not the smallest

¹ Bishop Lightfoot (*Leaders in the Northern Church*, p. 51) says, "The claims of Rome in this early age were modest indeed compared with her later assumptions. It is an enormous stride from the supremacy of Gregory the Great to the practical despotism claimed by Hildebrand and Innocent III. in the eleventh and succeeding centuries, as it is again a still vaster stride from the latter to the absolute infallibility of Pius IX. in the nineteenth century."

² Tillemont, x. 809.

³ Constantinople had been given precedence over Alexandria by the second Ecumenical Council.

⁴ Tillemont, *loc. cit.*

reason to suppose that they expressed any sorrow for their previous line of action, or any acknowledgement of any divinely appointed primacy in the see of Rome. There is no trace of any such notion in S. Chrysostom's voluminous writings. S. Flavian and S. Chrysostom appear to have maintained the ground which they had always taken, and they were received on their own terms; and so the Church was, after many years of division, restored to a state of peace. Acacius and S. Isidore returned from Rome to Egypt together; and Acacius was able to carry on to Antioch "letters of communion for S. Flavian and his flock from the bishops of Egypt and of the West."¹ A certain number of the Eustathians still kept up a separation, although, after the reunion of the Church, a great many were received by S. Flavian into the Catholic fold. The schism finally came to an end about the year 415, during the pontificate of Alexander, Bishop of Antioch. S. Flavian himself had died, about the year 404, at the great age of ninety-five. For fifty-five years, that is to say, from the time when he was thirty-four to the time when he was eighty-nine, he had lived outside the Roman communion. As we have seen, there is no reason to suppose that, when peace was restored, he made any act of reparation for what Cardinal Wiseman would consider to be a life spent in schism. Nevertheless the learned Ultramontane, Pietro Ballerini, describes him as "a most celebrated bishop, who was the master of S. John Chrysostom, and whose name was enrolled in the register of the saints."²

APPENDIX I.

S. Chrysostom's view of S. Peter's position in connexion with the election of S. Matthias to the apostolate (see p. 366).

I HAVE admitted that it is quite possible that S. Chrysostom, though he never connects the primacy of S. Peter with any prerogatives of the see of Rome, may nevertheless have been so filled with veneration for the apostle whom he regarded as the founder of the Church of Antioch, as to be led to speak of him occasionally in an exaggerated way. But the

¹ Sozomen. *H. E.*, viii. 3; compare Socrat. *H. E.*, vi. 9. Notice how Sozomen mentions the bishops of Egypt before those of the West, although the latter included the pope. How could he have expressed himself in that way if he had accepted the papal theory?

² "Episcopus celeberrimus, qui S. Joannis Chrysostomi magister extitit, et in Sanctorum album relatus fuit" (Petr. Ballerin. *de vi ac rat. primat. Rom. Pont.*, edit. 1845, p. 135).

reader must be warned against accepting the account given by Dr. Rivington of S. Chrysostom's views about S. Peter's position in relation to the election of S. Matthias to the apostolate.¹ Dr. Rivington says that "when S. Chrysostom asks the question, 'Might not Peter by himself have elected?' he answers categorically, emphatically, 'Certainly.'" In this passage Dr. Rivington has fallen into two mistakes. He has, in the first place, been misled by the corrupt Benedictine text, which, in the case of S. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Acts, is entirely untrustworthy.² But in the second place, even if it were possible to accept the Benedictine text,³ Dr. Rivington has misunderstood S. Chrysostom's teaching, as there set forth. I will take these two points in their order. The first is perhaps rather a matter of form than of substance. The second is substantial.

1. The Oxford translators, having before them "the old text," that is to say, the genuine text of these Homilies on the Acts, translate the passage, from which Dr. Rivington quotes, as follows: "Then, why did it not rest with Peter to make the election himself? What was the motive? This; that he might not seem to bestow it of favour. And besides, he was not yet endowed with the Spirit." The question, "Might not Peter by himself have elected?" and the categorical, emphatic answer, "Certainly," are not to be found in the genuine text. There is no trace of them in the New College manuscript;⁴ and evidently there was no trace of them in the Paris manuscripts used by the Oxford translators. But to this it may be answered that even the Oxford translation implies that conceivably Peter might have made the election himself, though in that translation there is no such categorical statement of the fact as appears in the Benedictine text. That is true, but S. Chrysostom's real meaning will be better understood by a consideration of what I have to say about Dr. Rivington's second mistake.

2. Dr. Rivington tells us⁵ that "S. Peter called on *the apostles*⁶ to elect one in place of Judas, to supply the number of twelve in the apostolic college." This account can hardly be considered accurate. S. Peter was addressing, not "the apostles," but "the brethren,"⁷ or, as S. Chrysostom read in his copy of the Acts, "the disciples," of whom there were about a hundred and twenty present. S. Chrysostom dwells on the fact that some of those who were addressed were women. Commenting on S. Peter's words, "Men and brethren,"⁸ he says, "see the dignity of the Church,

¹ *Authority*, p. 73, 2nd edit.

² See note 2, on p. 115.

³ The passages of S. Chrysostom, to which reference is made in this Appendix, occur in his third Homily on the Acts (*Opp.*, ed. Ben., ix. 23-25, and in the *Oxford translation*, pp. 37-40).

⁴ Tom. i. fol. 65.

⁵ *Authority*, p. 72.

⁶ The italics are mine.

⁷ Acts i. 15. "In diebus illis exurgens Petrus in medio fratrum dixit (erat autem turba hominum simul fere centum viginti)"—Vulgate. The Revised Version is in close agreement with the Vulgate.

⁸ S. Chrysostom accounts for S. Peter, rather than anybody else, having stood up in the midst of the hundred and twenty to address the others, by three considerations, namely, (1) the ardour of his character; (2) his apostolic office; (3) he

the angelic condition! No distinction there, *neither male nor female*. I would that the churches were such now." S. Chrysostom lays the greatest stress on the fact that the choice of the new apostle, or at any rate the selection of the two names, was committed "to the whole body" of the Church. S. Chrysostom nowhere in this passage contrasts S. Peter with the other apostles; but he contrasts the multitude of brethren, sometimes with S. Peter and sometimes with the whole choir of the apostles. According to the reading of the Benedictine editors, S. Chrysostom, speaking of the apostles, asks the question, "Why of their own selves do they not make the election?" Thus, so far from saying that "S. Peter called on the apostles to elect," he draws attention to the fact that they did not elect. Further on S. Chrysostom says, "Observe how Peter does everything with the common consent [of the whole body of brethren], nothing autocratically, nor imperiously. And he did not say simply thus: 'Instead of Judas *we* elect this man.'"¹ Notice how S. Chrysostom assumes that, if S. Peter had announced a name, he would have made the announcement on behalf of the apostolic body, of whom he was the mouthpiece. But he and the other apostles preferred to leave the whole body of the Church to make the election in complete freedom. When once it is perceived that in S. Chrysostom's mind there is no separation between S. Peter and the other apostles in regard to this transaction, all becomes clear. There was on the one side the apostolic college, with S. Peter as its leader and mouthpiece. There was on the other side the multitude of the brethren. S. Peter, as the leader of the apostolic college, might very naturally have made a mental selection of one or more names, and might have submitted it or them to his brother-apostles; but he preferred to "keep clear of all invidiousness," and "to defer the decision to the whole body" of the Church. That seems to me to be S. Chrysostom's view throughout this somewhat obscure passage.

It is a satisfaction to be able to quote the opinion of the great Bossuet, as agreeing with my conclusion and as supporting some points in my interpretation. He is replying to some anonymous writer, who had cited in favour of papal autocracy the very passage which gave rise to this discussion. Bossuet says, "In this passage our anonymous friend dreams that Chrysostom intended to say, that Peter by his own authority was able to settle the whole business, without any consultation with his brethren; but that is far from the mind of Chrysostom, and from [the practice of]

had been put in trust by Christ with the flock;" (3) "he had precedence in honour" (two of the "*old text*" Paris manuscripts read *προτιμότερος*, the other one and the New College manuscript and also the *Catena* read *προτιμώμενος*). The reference to the primacy of honour, coming as the climax after the reference to S. Peter's having been put in trust with the flock, fits in with S. Chrysostom's view that the injunction, "Feed My sheep," had to do with apostolic and not with primatial jurisdiction (compare what I have said on pp. 123-126).

¹ The New College manuscript (tom. i. fol. 60) here agrees with the Benedictine reading, except that it reads, *οὐδὲν ἀρχοντικῶς*, instead of *οὐδὲν αὐθεντικῶς*, *οὐδὲ ἀρχικῶς*. It is fair to point out that the two passages translated in the text from the Benedictine edition, do not appear in the Oxford translation, and are therefore absent, I suppose, from the "*old text*" Paris manuscripts. However, they at any rate show how S. Chrysostom's meaning was understood by the mediaeval concocters of the text, which the Benedictines unfortunately adopted.

those times. Chrysostom meant that it was lawful for Peter, who was the first of the sacred band, that as he had made the opening speech about the election, so in that same speech he might have designated and selected some one, to whose election the others would afterwards have readily given their consent. By such a method of proceeding he would have been the first, not the sole elector. But Peter did not follow this course. He said indefinitely, 'Of these must one become a witness with us of the resurrection of Christ.' Chrysostom therefore draws attention to the modesty of Peter, who was unwilling to bias the judgements of the others."¹ There can, I think, be no doubt that Bossuet was right in holding the view that S. Chrysostom had no intention of attributing to S. Peter the power to name the new apostle by his own sole authority. There is no solid ground for the paragraph² in which Dr. Rivington triumphs over the venerable author of the *Roman Question*.

¹ *Def. Decl. Cler. Gall.*, viii. 17, *Œuvres*, xxxii. 627, ed. Versailles, 1817.

² *Authority*, pp. 72, 73.

LECTURE XII.

THE ACACIAN TROUBLES.

IN this lecture I intend to continue, and if possible to conclude, what I have to say on the true nature of the unity of the Church, giving further illustrations, from the sayings and actions of the saints, of the great principle, that separation from the communion of the see of Rome does not necessarily carry with it exclusion from the fellowship of the Catholic Church.

During the greater part of the last few lectures we have been considering the troubles caused by the Eustathian schism. I propose now to pass over nearly a hundred years, and to deal with the dissension which arose in the Church in consequence of the excommunication and deposition of Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, by Felix III. of Rome, in the year 484. By that time the Roman see had very much enlarged and consolidated its power. As we have seen, S. Leo had, in A.D. 445, obtained from Valentinian III. an imperial constitution, which, so far as the law of the State could effect such a result, subjected the bishops to the will of the pope.¹ Moreover, at the Council of Chalcedon, in A.D. 451, although much was done which S. Leo disliked extremely, yet for the first time in the history of the Church the legates of the pope presided at an Ecumenical Council,²

¹ See pp. 200, 201.

² At the Council of Ephesus, although S. Cyril held Pope Celestine's proxy, empowering him to "join the authority" of the Roman see to that of his own Alexandrine see for the particular purpose of deposing and excommunicating Nestorius, if he should continue in the heresy which he openly avowed, yet, as Bossuet (*Def. Cler. Gall.*, VII. xiii. 7) rightly observes, "Cyril had not been expressly delegated to the council, of which Celestine had as yet no thought when he commissioned Cyril to represent him." The pope sent other legates, namely, two bishops and a priest, to represent him at the council; and they in the pope's name promulgated his assent and the assent of all the West to what had been there done. Nevertheless Cyril, as being the highest dignitary present, presided, taking precedence of the legates who represented Celestine in the council. This was quite in accordance with the Church's ancient custom. So Hosius, though he was not the pope's legate, took precedence at Nicaea of the two priests who represented Silvester; and at Carthage S. Aurelius and the Numidian primate, Valentinus, took precedence of Faustinus, the legate of Pope Boniface. The fact that S. Cyril did not act as Pope Celestine's legate at Ephesus, but presided in virtue of the dignity of his own see of Alexandria, has been proved by demonstration and with full setting forth of the evidence by De Launoi (*Epistolarum* lib. viii.

and the sanction which the council gave to S. Leo's great dogmatic letter to S. Flavian of Constantinople, given, as it was, after careful examination and comparison of its statements with the writings of earlier Fathers, helped largely to consolidate the reputation of the Roman see for orthodoxy. Again, S. Leo presented the unusual spectacle of a pope who was also a theologian; and in the terse Latin of his sermons he had worked out what may be called the first systematic exposition of the papal interpretation of the great Petrine texts. S. Leo showed the way, and his successors boldly followed. One may mention specially Felix III. (483-492); Gelasius I. (492-496); Symmachus (498-514); and Hormisdas (514-523).¹

The quarrel with Acacius began in the year 482, during the pontificate of Simplicius. There can be no question that Acacius was very much to blame, and it seems to me that he richly deserved to be deposed and excommunicated. He had been made Patriarch of Constantinople in A.D. 471, and for eleven years in all his public actions had appeared to be a champion of the Catholic faith, as it had been defined at Chalcedon. But in the year 482, the see of Alexandria having become vacant, John Talaia, an orthodox priest, was canonically elected² to the throne of S. Mark. Unfortunately, the letter which, according to custom, he wrote to the Patriarch of Constantinople, to announce his election and consecration, miscarried. Acacius took offence at the seeming want of courtesy, and he watched for opportunities, when he was conversing with the Emperor Zeno, to disparage the new Patriarch of Alexandria. He proposed to the Emperor that Peter Mongus, the Monophysite anti-patriarch, should be recognized as the true patriarch, on the condition that he should accept and promote the so-called *Henoticon*, a document inspired, if not drawn up, by himself, which was intended

Ep. 4, ad Antonium Faurum, edit. 1731, tom. v. pars ii. pp. 581-594). There is, however, one point of importance, which De Launoi has not brought out with such clearness as I think it deserves. He does indeed mention that on various occasions, when S. Cyril was not able to preside, the signature of Juvenal of Jerusalem precedes the signature of the Roman legates. But he does not point out that the reason for this precedence was that, when S. Cyril did not preside, Juvenal, who was next in rank to him, and was most certainly not a legate, acted as president (cf. Coleti, iii. 1165, and see Tillemont, xiv. 432).

¹ Hilary (461-467) and Simplicius (467-483) intervened between S. Leo and Felix III., and Anastasius II. (496-498) intervened between Gelasius and Symmachus. Anastasius was less grasping and in every way more attractive than his immediate predecessors and successors.

² It should, however, be mentioned that the Emperor Zeno wrote to Pope Felix III. later on, and informed him that John Talaia "had solemnly sworn that he would in no wise come forward as a candidate for the throne of Alexandria, and that having transgressed and violated his oaths he had been guilty of extreme sacrilege" (Evagr. *H. E.*, iii. 20).

as a compromise on the basis of which Catholics and Monophysites might unite. It recognized the dogmatic decisions of the first three Ecumenical Councils, but, though it anathematized Eutyches, it was silent on the subject of the binding authority of the Chalcedonian definition.¹ The Emperor fell in with Acacius' proposal, and Peter Mongus on his side accepted the *Henoticon*. Accordingly, he was enthroned at Alexandria as the patriarch recognized by the Emperor, and in his letters to Pope Simplicius and to Acacius he professed to accept the Council of Chalcedon. At heart he remained a Monophysite; and very soon, when he found that by his compliance with Catholic orthodoxy he was losing his old Monophysite adherents, he anathematized Chalcedon and the tome of S. Leo. Then again, when Acacius called him to account, he once more accepted "the holy Council of Chalcedon."² Altogether he was a most unfit person to sit as a successor of S. Mark and S. Athanasius. Acacius had undoubtedly sullied his own orthodoxy by promoting Mongus' intrusion into the see of Alexandria, and by remaining in communion with him, when it became evident that the purity of his faith was more than doubtful.³

Meanwhile the true patriarch, John Talaia, had fled to Rome, where he was honourably received by Simplicius. That pope, however, died a few weeks after Talaia's arrival, and was succeeded by Felix III.; and to him Talaia addressed a formal petition and complaint, in which various charges were brought against Acacius. The pope sent two suburbicarian bishops, Vitalis of Truentum and Misenus of Cumae, as legates to Constantinople; they carried with them letters to Acacius and to the Emperor, and also a formal citation commanding Acacius to present himself without loss of time at Rome, there to answer before a synod (*in conventu*) of his brother-bishops the charges brought against him.⁴ When the legates arrived in Constantinople, they were first imprisoned and then bribed, and ultimately they gave in to the wishes of

¹ It is important to remember that the *Henoticon* was not in itself heretical, but it needed to be supplemented by other tests, if Monophysites were to be excluded from communion (see Natalis Alexand. *Hist. Eccl.*, ix. 615, edit. 1786, Bing. ad Rhenum).

² The letter of Mongus to Acacius may be read in the *Church History* of Evagrius (iii. 17).

³ But it is difficult for us to judge with any certainty as to the *degree* of Acacius' faultiness. We do not know whether he had convincing proofs of Mongus' heresy. Heretics are often very slippery; and it should be remembered that in the fourth century the see of Rome was for a long while deceived as to Marcellus of Ancyra. The popes held him to be orthodox long after the Catholic bishops of the East had detected his unsoundness. S. Basil's complaints about the way in which the popes had "supported heresy" in the case of Marcellus have been quoted on p. 164.

⁴ Coleti, v. 217, 218.

the Emperor and the patriarch. They publicly communicated with Acacius and with the representatives of Peter Mongus, and during the course of the service the name of Mongus was recited in the reading of the diptychs. On the return journey they took back with them a letter from Acacius to Felix, in which Mongus was praised, and in which Acacius avowed that he held communion with him. The pope lost no time in summoning a council of the suburbicarian bishops, which met at Rome in July, 484. In that council the legates were deposed from the episcopate and excommunicated; and the pope passed sentence on Acacius. By that sentence Felix professed to deprive the Constantinopolitan patriarch of the episcopate and of Catholic communion, and to cut him off from being numbered among the faithful.¹ The sentence was signed not only by the pope, but also by sixty-seven other Italian bishops.

As I have already said, I think that Acacius thoroughly deserved to be deposed and excommunicated. But it is quite another question whether the pope had authority to do what he did in the matter. He certainly had the right to separate Acacius from the communion of the Roman Church; and inasmuch as his sentence was sanctioned by the Roman synod, it would avail to cut Acacius off from the communion of the suburbicarian churches generally. But separation from the communion of the Roman Church, or even from the communion of all the churches of Central and Southern Italy, would not effect the separation of Acacius from the fellowship of the Catholic Church, unless the Roman sentence were confirmed by the episcopate at large, expressing its judgement either in an Ecumenical Council or in separate local councils. The tribunal, before which Acacius ought to have been brought, and which would have had authority to depose him and to cut him off from the unity of the Church, would have been the synod of the whole patriarchate of Constantinople, which included the three exarchates of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace.² The

¹ Coleti, v. 167-169.

² Strictly speaking, the tribunal of first instance would have been the synod of the province, with an appeal to the synod of the patriarchate, whose decision was final, unless an Ecumenical Council were assembled to consider the case (see the so-called sixth canon of the second Ecumenical Council, a canon which was really enacted at the Constantinopolitan Council of 382). S. Chrysostom, in a letter to Pope Innocent I., describes how, when the Emperor Arcadius wished him to try Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, he begged to be excused, "knowing the laws of our fathers, and out of respect and honour to the man, having moreover letters from him, which pointed out that causes should not be drawn beyond the countries to which they belonged, *but that the affairs of each province should be transacted therein*" (S. Chrys. *Ep. i. ad Innocentium Episc. Rom.*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 516). From this letter it appears clear that both S. Chrysostom and Theophilus agreed that a patriarch should be tried first of all by the bishops of his province. Moreover, as S. Chrysostom was writing to the pope,

synod of the patriarchate, or the synod of the whole East, or the supreme tribunal of an Ecumenical Council, would have been fully competent to exercise jurisdiction over Acacius. The synod of the suburbicarian bishops was wholly incompetent to do anything more than separate Acacius from the particular communion of their churches. His episcopal office and his membership in the Catholic Church was not subject to their jurisdiction. Perhaps it will be replied that, owing to the confusions in the East and the complicity of the Emperor with the misdoings of Acacius, it was impossible to expect a synod to be assembled, which should have the courage to do justice in the case, and that there was need for the pope to intervene, and if necessary to stretch his prerogative, so that somehow the Church's orthodoxy might be vindicated. An argument of that kind seems to be based on notions which imply forgetfulness of the relations of the Church to our Lord, and of His promises to her. Our Lord, who is the one and only Head of the Church, is quite able to take care of her, and in His own time and way to lead her out of her difficulties and confusions into complete unity in regard to all necessary articles of faith. He can, when He

and refers to the principle as if it was established, we may conclude that he anticipated that the pope would agree on this point with himself and his enemy Theophilus. It is possible, however, that at Constantinople the exceptional institution, known as the *σύνδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, would have taken the place of the provincial synod. But, whatever might have been the strict law in regard to the tribunal of first instance, in practice, when the case of a patriarch was to be investigated, the larger synod of the patriarchate or even of the whole East would have been assembled. One may instance the synods at Antioch, which tried Paul of Samosata; and compare Tillemont, xi. 195. It is worth while noticing, as a proof of the growth of the papal and Italian claims, that in December, 381, or January, 382, the Council of Milan, under S. Ambrose, writing to the Emperor Theodosius on the subject of the disputed succession at Antioch and also about a similar difficulty at Constantinople in connexion with Maximus the Cynic and Nectarius, pleads that the East alone ought not to settle such matters, but that an Ecumenical Council was needed. S. Ambrose and his council expressly say, "*We do not claim that the right of examination belongs to us as a peculiar privilege, but we ought to have had a share in what should be a common decision*" (*Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xiii. § 4, P. L., xvi. 992). The Emperor seems to have written back to the Italians that their request was unreasonable and offensive to the Eastern bishops, and that their argument in favour of the necessity for an Ecumenical Council was insufficient; that the affairs of Nectarius and Flavian were in the East, and all the parties were there present, and consequently that these cases ought to be settled in the East and by the East, and that there ought to be no innovation in the bounds which the Fathers had set (see the synodical reply, *Fidei tuæ*, addressed to Theodosius by another Milanese Council, *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xiv., P. L., xvi. 994, 995, and compare Tillemont, x. 150). There can be no question that the Emperor was stating the immemorial practice of the Church, not only in the East, but in Africa and elsewhere. The Italians had to give way. However, the point to be noticed is that in 381 the Italians only claimed in a humble sort of way a *share* in the decision; whereas in 484 the local Roman Council professed to depose Acacius, who was an Eastern prelate, without the East having anything to say in the matter. The claim was simply revolutionary.

sees fit, secure for her the opportunity of exercising such acts of discipline as will purge her from seeming complicity with heresy. There was no need for the pope or for any one else to transgress the bounds of his jurisdiction. In the times of the Arian troubles the Church had been in much greater difficulty and confusion than she was in the time of Acacius and Peter Mongus, and yet our Lord guided her in the midst of the storm, and brought her at last into unity through the truth. I grant that extreme cases might arise, when large sections of the Church might appear to have lapsed into undisguised heresy, and when, on the principle that *necessity knows no law*, it would be competent for any bishop to intervene in dioceses beyond his jurisdiction, and to do what he could to provide faithful pastors for the flock of Christ. If the pope had acted in this case on that principle, a good defence might perhaps be made on his behalf. But Pope Felix never attempted to defend his conduct on the plea of necessity. He acted throughout as if he was the possessor of a universal jurisdiction inherited from S. Peter. He must have sanctioned the synodical letter of the council of forty-two Italian bishops which met in the basilica of S. Peter at Rome in October, 485. They wrote as follows: "As often as the priests of the Lord [*i.e.* the bishops] are assembled within the limits of Italy to treat of ecclesiastical causes, especially those which concern the faith, the custom is observed that the successor of the bishops of the apostolic see, as representing the entire episcopate of all Italy, should himself make all decrees, that he may exercise that care of all the churches which belongs to him as the head of all. For the Lord said to the blessed Apostle Peter, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' In obedience to which words, the 318 holy Fathers assembled at Nicaea granted the right of confirming and initiating [ecclesiastical] proceedings to the holy Roman Church, both of which rights the succession [of Pontiffs] by the grace of Christ preserves, even to this our age."¹ Then they proceed to apply what has been said to the case of Acacius, on whom, "following the decree of the apostolic see," they pronounce *anathema*. This, then, was the authorized Roman account of the conduct of Pope Felix. He claimed the right to depose Acacius from his bishopric and to cut him off from the number of the faithful, on the ground that he, as Roman pontiff, was the

¹ "Confirmationem rerum atque auctoritatem sanctae Romanae ecclesiae detulerunt, quae utraque usque ad aetatem nostram successiones omnes Christi gratia praestante custodiunt."—*Collect. Avellan.*, ed. Günther, *Ep.* lxx. § 10, p. 159.

head of all the churches, having the care of all. And these rights are traced up ultimately to our Lord's words to S. Peter, and proximately to a decree of the Nicene Council. To what Nicene decree does the Roman Synod refer? No such decree appears among the genuine canons of that council. As usual, the Roman claims are based upon a spurious interpolation. Certainly, if for one moment one could conceive these claims to be legitimate, one would have to say that the popes have been the most unfortunate set of people that have ever existed. On this hypothesis, it would follow that a true claim, which, if it is true, may be rightly described as the chief point in the whole of the Christian system, has been perpetually commended to the acceptance of the world on grounds which will not bear examination. To use Père Gratry's words, "The question has been gangrened with fraud." There can be no doubt that in this instance the Roman Council is referring to the spurious clause interpolated at the beginning of the sixth Nicene Canon, "The Roman Church always had the primacy." That clause occurred in the copy of the Nicene Canons which was used by the Roman legates at the Council of Chalcedon; and in this Acacian controversy Gelasius, the successor of Pope Felix, refers to it in a certain *tractatus*,¹ of which fragments remain. The clause is spurious,² but even if it were genuine, it is difficult to see how the Roman Council of 485 could extract out of its somewhat vague wording any proof that the Fathers of Nicaea granted the right of confirming and initiating proceedings to the Roman Church.³ And yet, if the council did not refer to this spurious clause, there is absolutely nothing else in the genuine canons of Nicaea which bears in the remotest degree on the claims to primatial jurisdiction put forth by the popes. The authority asserted by Felix, when he passed sentence of deposition and excommunication on Acacius, was undoubtedly a usurped authority, which the Eastern churches could not recognize without danger to their own liberties and to the liberties of the whole Church.⁴ Acacius deserved punishment, but the punishment

¹ Coleti, v. 341; and compare the note by the Ballerini in *P. L.*, lvi. 393.

² The spuriousness of the clause about the primacy is evidently acknowledged by Perrone, for, speaking (*Praelect. Theol.*, tom. ii. pars i. p. 418, edit. 1841) of the sixth canon of Nicaea and the twenty-eighth of Chalcedon, he says, "Cum igitur de ecclesiae Romanae primatu nullo modo agatur in allatis canonibus." Compare Hefele, i. 397, E. tr.; and see Dr. Bright's *Additional Note on the sixth Nicene canon* (*The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 481-483).

³ Nor was any such right granted to the see of Rome by the Sardican canons, which the popes of the fifth century used to quote as if they were Nicene.

⁴ It must be remembered that Acacius was not accused of being personally a heretic. His principal fault (and it was a very great one) was that he was too easy in accepting the assurances of Peter Mongus that he venerated "the holy

inflicted on him by Felix was *ultra vires*, and therefore invalid. It was, as a matter of course, ignored by Acacius himself and by the whole Eastern Church; and the result was that there ensued a complete breach of communion between the East and West for thirty-five years—that is to say, from A.D. 484 to A.D. 519.¹

It is important to notice that the breach of communion was *complete*. A hundred years earlier Pope Damasus could refuse his communion to S. Meletius, and yet could remain in communion with S. Basil, who energetically supported S. Meletius.² The popes did not then put forth the view that all those whom they separated from the communion of the Roman Church were in consequence separated from the communion of the Catholic Church. But the Roman claims had very much developed between the time of Damasus and the time of Felix and Gelasius. It was not merely Acacius who was excommunicated, but by the Roman party it was held that all who in any way communicated with Acacius, whether during his lifetime or after his death, were tainted with the taint of communion with Peter Mongus; and so the anathema which had been pronounced on Acacius was extended to them, and they became, in the view of the pope, altogether external to the Church. The completeness of the breach is shown very clearly by what took place at a Council of Rome under Gelasius in the year 495. At that council, Misenus, the former Bishop of Cumae, who had been sent by Pope Felix as one of his legates to Constantinople, and who had there been induced to communicate with Acacius and with the representatives of Peter Mongus, and had in consequence been deposed from the episcopate and excommunicated, was restored to communion with the Church and was re-established in his former see. The documents containing his humble petition for mercy and his recantation are preserved in the acts of the council. Misenus professes before the council that he rejects all heresies, “especially the Eutychian heresy with its originator Eutyches and his follower Dioscorus, and those who succeeded the latter, and those who held communion with him, namely, Timothy the Cat,³ Peter

Council of Chalcedon;” while all the time the crafty heretic was repudiating that council among his Monophysite friends in Alexandria. Acacius must, one would think, have been aware of this, and if he had been really zealous for the revealed doctrine of our Lord’s Incarnation, he would have taken measures to expose the double dealing of Mongus, and would then have withdrawn from his communion.

¹ On the completeness of the breach of communion between the East and West from A.D. 484 to A.D. 519, see Appendix J, pp. 409–417.

² Compare the remarks of Tillemont, xvi. 642.

³ For an account of the origin of this singular nickname, see Dr. Bright’s article in Smith and Wace, *D. C. B.*, iv. 1031.

[Mongus] of Alexandria, Acacius of Constantinople, Peter [the Fuller] of Antioch, and all their accomplices and *all those who communicate with them*; all these he repudiates, condemns, and for ever anathematizes, and all these and all like them he curses with dreadful imprecations,¹ and promises that he will never have any sort of fellowship with such, and that for the future he will be utterly separate from all of them." After this, Pope Gelasius made a long speech to the council, which concludes as follows: "In consideration of the fact that Misenus has, according to the rule, professed that he detests all heresies, and especially the Eutychian heresy, together with Eutyches, Dioscorus, Timothy the Cat, Peter of Alexandria, Acacius of Constantinople, and Peter of Antioch, and all their successors, and *all those who follow and communicate with them*, and that he strikes them with an everlasting anathema, let him again partake of the grace of apostolic communion and of the episcopal dignity which he originally received by a Catholic consecration." Then all the bishops² and priests rose up in the synod and exclaimed fifteen times, "O Christ, hear us! long life to Gelasius!" and twelve times they said, "Lord Peter, preserve him!" and seven times they said, "May he hold the see of Peter during the years of Peter!"³ and six times they said, "We see thee, who art the vicar of Christ!" and again they said, "May he hold the see of Peter during the years of Peter!" and this they repeated thirty-seven times.⁴ Such was the spirit which the popes of the latter part of the fifth century had managed to infuse into the bishops whom they consecrated, and who were under their immediate rule.

We must now turn to the East, and see how the Eastern Church was faring during these thirty-five years, when it was absolutely cut off from fellowship with the Roman Church, and when, according to the Roman view, it was in consequence cut off from the Catholic Church, and was abiding in a state of execrable schism.

Acacius had died during the lifetime of Felix in 489. He was succeeded in the patriarchal throne of Constantinople by Fravitas, who, however, died three or four months after his consecration. He had written to Pope Felix announcing his succession to the see, and asking for his communion. The pope's reply arrived in Constantinople after the death of Fravitas, and was received by his successor Euphemius. The

¹ "Horribiliter execrari."

² There were forty-six bishops, probably all of them suburbicarian.

³ Alluding to the utterly unhistorical tradition that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years.

⁴ See the whole of the acts in Coleti, v. 397-402, and in the *Collectio Avellana*, ed. Günther, *Ep.* ciii., pp. 474-487.

consecration of Euphemius seemed to be providentially ordered, with the view of giving to the Church an opportunity of getting the schism healed. He was a courageous and holy man, full of zeal for the Catholic faith, and ready to suffer in its defence. Before his enthronement a synodical letter arrived from Peter Mongus, addressed to Fravitas ; but, when Euphemius perceived that Mongus in this letter anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, he cut him off from his communion and expunged his name from the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople. Mongus died shortly afterwards, and was succeeded in the see of Alexandria by one who bore the honoured name of Athanasius. Unfortunately, this successor was also a Monophysite in doctrine, and Euphemius refused to hold communion with him. For the same reason Euphemius refrained from communicating with Palladius of Antioch ; while, on the other hand, he admitted to his communion Sallustius, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who accepted the decrees of Chalcedon. Euphemius, on his accession, wrote a synodical letter to Pope Felix, having first replaced his name on the diptychs of his church.¹ The pope accepted the letter, and, having read it, felt assured of Euphemius' doctrinal orthodoxy, and was well inclined towards him ; but he would not grant to him episcopal communion, because Euphemius had not expunged the names of Acacius and Fravitas from the diptychs.² Thus the schism between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople continued. Assuredly the responsibility lay now entirely on the pope. There could be no pretence of supposing that Euphemius was inclined to tamper with the faith. But he was not prepared to acknowledge the validity of Acacius' deposition,³ which had been the act of an Italian council without any participation of the Eastern Church. Whether Acacius was worthy of censure or not, he had remained free from any valid censure during his lifetime, and now Euphemius was entitled to argue that he had passed away from the judgement of men.⁴ The real

¹ It had been removed by Acacius, after his so-called deposition by Felix.

² Niceph. Callist. *H. E.*, xvi. 19, *Patrol. Graec.*, cxlvii. 153.

³ Euphemius seems to have laid stress on the fact that the pretended deposition had been the act of only *one* man, viz. the pope (see Gelas. *Commonitor. ad Faustum*, Coleti, v. 295).

⁴ Nicole and other Roman Catholic writers, who uphold the righteousness of the cause of Euphemius, allege, as a further justification of his proceedings, that *dictum* of S. Augustine in which he deprecates the excommunication of those who are likely to draw after them a multitude of persons ("*qui habent sociam multitudinem*"). I will quote one paragraph of Nicole's argument : "Quoiqu' on ne puisse douter qu' Acace ne fut coupable, il n'est pas certain néanmoins que tout coupable puisse être déposé et excommunié par toutes sortes de juges. Les Orientaux prétendoient qu'un Patriarche de Constantinople ne pouvoit être jugé ni déposé que par un concile auquel l'Église d'Orient eût part. D'ailleurs la règle

point which divided the churches was no longer the duty of safe-guarding the true faith of the Incarnation, and the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, but the claim of the pope to depose an Eastern patriarch, who was not personally heretical, and to cut him off from the number of the faithful. If Euphemius had given way on that point, he would have betrayed the Catholic system of Church government, and he would have been worthy of all censure. The pope was fighting for his own baseless claim to autocracy, and it was the duty of every well-instructed Catholic to resist him.

Our information in regard to this breach of communion between the East and the West is mainly derived from the letters of the popes and from the acts of Roman councils, who of course regard it from the Roman point of view. It may therefore be well to quote an account of the matter from an Eastern writer; and one could not go to a better authority than to Cyril of Scythopolis, the friend and biographer of several of the saints who lived during the period of the schism. Cardinal Baronius says of him that he was the most accurate and trustworthy writer of saints' lives that he knew, always excepting S. Athanasius and S. Jerome.¹ He also says of him that he was "illustrious on account of his sanctity."² Alban Butler refers to him as "one of the best writers of antiquity."³ This Cyril of Scythopolis, speaking in his life of S. Sabas about S. Elias of Jerusalem, says, "When the Patriarch Elias had obtained the see of Jerusalem in the third year of the reign of the Emperor Anastasius⁴ [A.D. 493], the Church of God was thrown into confusion, being divided into three parts; for the bishops of Rome dissented from those of Byzantium because the name of Acacius, a former bishop of Constantinople, had been inserted in the sacred diptychs; and Acacius had not followed the preciseness (τὴν ἀκριβείαν⁵) of the Romans. Moreover, the

de Saint Augustin : Qu'il ne faut point excommunier ceux qui entraînent avec eux une multitude de personnes, 'qui habent sociam multitudinem,' étoit très considérable à l'égard d'un Patriarche qui attiroit avec lui tout l'Orient. Ainsi les Evêques attachés [sic] à la cour s'étant unis à Acace, les plus saints Evêques d'Orient ne crurent pas se devoir séparer de sa communion, de peur d'augmenter le mal au lieu de la guérir" (Nicole, *de l'Unité de l'Eglise*, liv. ii. chap. x. pp. 308 f., edit. 1708). This treatise of Nicole is styled by Mgr. Bouvier, Bishop of Le Mans, who died in 1854, an "*exquisitum opus*."

¹ *Annal.*, s.a. 491, tom. vi. p. 468, ed. Antverp., 1658.

² See Baronius' annotated edition of the Roman Martyrology, in his notice of S. Sabas, who is commemorated on December 5 (p. 533, ed. Antverp., 1589).

³ In the *Life of S. Euthymius* (January 20).

⁴ The reign of Anastasius lasted from 491 to 518.

⁵ There is, I think, a slight touch of irony in the application of the word ἀκριβεία to the Romans. So, more than 120 years earlier, S. Basil, in a letter to S. Eusebius of Samosata (see p. 304), with very marked irony describes Pope Damasus and the Roman clergy as ἀκριβέστεροι (*Ep.* cxxxviii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 230). And S. Gregory Nazianzen describes the pope and the Westerns as

Byzantine bishops dissented from the Alexandrines, who were anathematizing the Council of Chalcedon, and were communicating with the memory of Dioscorus, who had been deposed by that synod. The result was that Elias was only able to communicate with Euphemius, the Bishop of Byzantium; for, as has been said, *the Westerns had separated themselves*,¹ and Palladius of Antioch, in order to curry favour with the Emperor, was anathematizing the decrees of Chalcedon, and was embracing the communion of the Alexandrines."² It apparently did not occur to S. Elias that it would be his duty at all hazards to get into communion with Rome. From the Eastern point of view, "the Westerns had separated themselves." And this was strictly true. The separation was the act of the pope, and the responsibility for the schism lay on him. S. Elias was not a courtier bishop. If he had been, he would have communicated with the Monophysite bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, who were favoured by the Emperor. He was an orthodox Eastern Catholic, and he therefore naturally embraced the communion of Euphemius. Nineteen years afterwards, in A.D. 513, he was driven from his see by the heretical Emperor, and was banished to the shores of the Red Sea, because he refused to communicate with the Monophysite Severus, who had been intruded by the Emperor into the see of Antioch. There he died in the year 518, ten days after the death of his persecutor. He died, as he had lived, out of communion with the Roman Church; but he is venerated by that church as a saint, and is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on July 4.

The persecution of Euphemius had preceded that of S. Elias, for the former had been driven from his see by Anastasius in the year 495. He lived for twenty years in exile, dying at Ancyra in 515. His name ought to be had in honour throughout all generations as a confessor for the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, and as a firm defender of Catholic liberty against papal usurpation. He also died, as he had lived, out of communion with the Roman see.

His successor at Constantinople was S. Macedonius. During the whole of his episcopate this saint was being persecuted by the Emperor, because he maintained the true faith in regard to the Incarnation, and upheld the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. In the year 511 the Emperor banished him, as he had banished his predecessor; and he

"the self-styled defenders of the canons" (see p. 503). There was a something about Roman ways, which made the great saints of the East shrug their shoulders.

¹ Τῶν δυτικῶν ὡς εἶρηται ἀποσχουισάντων.

² Cf. S. Cyril. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sab.*, cap. 1.

died at Gangra in 515, and was buried in the church of the holy martyr Callinicus. S. Theophanes tells us that after his death many miracles of healing were wrought at his tomb.¹ He died, as he had lived, out of communion with Rome; and in the year 519, when the breach was healed between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, Pope Hormisdas, regardless of S. Macedonius' sufferings for the faith and his sanctity, insisted on his name being expunged from the Constantinopolitan diptychs. This was done by the then Patriarch John, a poor-spirited man. But the exclusion did not last long. The Church of Constantinople soon replaced the name of her saintly patriarch on the sacred tablets, and he was reckoned among the saints. His feast is kept by the Eastern Church on the 25th of April.

But there would be no end, if I were to go into full details in regard to all the saintly names which make glorious the annals of the Eastern Church during that period, when she was separated from the communion of Rome. I will, however, make a list of some of them, arranging them according to the patriarchates into which the greater part of the Eastern Church was divided. To each name I will prefix the day on which he is commemorated either in the Eastern service-books or in the Roman Martyrology, and in connexion with most of the names I will add a few historical notes.

In the patriarchate of Constantinople.

April 25.—S. Macedonius the Patriarch (died in A.D. 515).

June 27.—S. Sampson the Receiver of strangers (died during the schism, according to Baronius).

October 1.—S. Romanus the Melodist (flourished *circa* A.D. 500).

December 11.—S. Daniel the Stylite (died *circa* A.D. 494).

In the patriarchate of Antioch.

July 4.—S. Flavian II. of Antioch (died in A.D. 518).

July 31.—The 350 Martyrs of Syria Secunda (died in A.D. 517).

In the patriarchate of Jerusalem.

January 11.—S. Theodosius the Coenobiarch (died in A.D. 529, at the age of 106).

January 26.—S. Gabriel the Archimandrite (died in A.D. 490).

July 4.—S. Elias the Patriarch (died in A.D. 518).

September 29.—S. Cyriacus the Anchorite (died in A.D. 556, at the age of 108).

October 28.—S. John the Chuzibite (flourished during the schism).

¹ S. Theoph. *Chronograph.*, A.C. 508.

November 30.—S. Zosimas the Wonder-worker (flourished during the schism).

December 5.—S. Sabas the Great (died in A.D. 532, at the age of 93).

December 8 (but in Rom. Mart. May 13).—S. John the Silentiary (died in A.D. 558, at the age of 104).

In the patriarchate of Alexandria.

July 27.—The 3911 Martyrs at Najrân (died in A.D. 522 or 523).

October 24.—S. Aretas and his 340 companions (martyred in A.D. 522 or 523).

October 27.—S. Elesbaan the King (was flourishing in A.D. 525).

October 27.—S. Pantaleon and his eight companions (were flourishing *circa* A.D. 500).

Some of these saints died before the healing of the schism, and therefore out of communion with Rome.¹ Others did not die until after the schism was healed, but they had become illustrious by their sanctity, and in some cases by their miracles, while they were out of communion with Rome. I do not remember that in any case there is the smallest particle of evidence to show that they viewed their restoration to communion with Rome as an event of any personal importance to themselves. They doubtless rejoiced that the unity of the Church was once more rendered unmistakably visible, and that the breach of communion between the Eastern and Western bishops had come to an end; but there is not the least reason for supposing that they regarded themselves as having been outside the Church before the pacification, and as having been brought within the true fold by means of that event.² I doubt if such an idea ever crossed the mind of any Eastern Catholic during the whole course of the controversy.³ The

¹ Mr. Richardson (*What are the Catholic claims?* p. 118) has a curious passage, in which he speaks of S. Meletius' separation from the communion of the Roman see as being a "unique example in antiquity." What can Mr. Richardson mean? Does he really think that S. Meletius was the only saint recognized by the Church, who lived outside the Roman communion? If that is his opinion, he is under a complete delusion, and either he has forgotten what he learnt when he was sitting on the "hard bench," of which he speaks in the note, or the instruction given to him must have been very misleading. Various passages in his somewhat flimsy book tempt one to speculate as to which of these two alternative suggestions gives the truer account of the mistakes into which he falls. For example, on p. 61 he speaks of the "*eternal Syncretism of the Son.*" If I had used such an expression when I sat on "hard benches" at Cambridge and at Cuddesdon, I should have been in some way made to understand that I was either grievously heretical or grossly ignorant.

² The Patriarch of Constantinople, S. Epiphanius, writing to Pope Hormisdas in 521, and speaking of the pope's arduous labours, says that by them his holiness "*omnia catholice ecclesie membra in unum Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi corpus cum prompto nititur animo conjungere*" (*P. L.*, lxiii. 506).

³ Among the Easterns I do not include the bishops of the provinces of Eastern

notion of the pope being the necessary centre of communion, which had been gradually developed in Rome, was a novelty even there, and was completely ignored in the East, where the original teaching about the Church's unity, as it had come down from the apostles, was faithfully retained and handed on.

I proceed to set down a few historical particulars concerning most of those holy persons.

S. Sampson the Receiver of strangers established a hospital at Constantinople, which was afterwards named after its saintly founder. His feast was celebrated at Constantinople with considerable solemnity. The law courts were closed on that day until divine service was finished. His name also occurs in the Roman Martyrology. Baronius thinks that he died during the reign of Anastasius; and, if so, he must have passed from earth to Paradise during the schism.¹ It is fair to say that Alemannus holds that there is no absurdity in supposing that he lived on into the reign of Justin,² or even to the beginning of that of Justinian.³ Father Verhoven, S.J., thinks that his death may not have occurred until 530 or 531.⁴ In any case, his career of sanctity must have

Ilyricum, who had always been reckoned as ecclesiastically belonging to the West (see pp. 156, 157). In the Acacian controversy many of them adhered to the East, but in doing so they broke away from their natural connexion. S. Cyril of Alexandria, in a letter to the Patriarch John of Antioch, speaking of the pope and the Western bishops, says, "They have also written copies to Rufus, the most reverend Bishop of Thessalonica, and to some others of the reverend bishops of Macedonia, who always agree with their decisions" (S. Cyril. Alex. *Ep. ad Joann. Antiochen.*, *Opp.*, ed. Aubert, vi. 43). It should in fairness be mentioned that certain communities of monks belonging to the order of the Acoemetæ, or *Sleepless ones*, who were very zealous for the Council of Chalcedon, and who considered that that council was disparaged by the Henoticon, on account of its silence, refrained from communicating with the Patriarchs Euphemius and S. Macedonius, and on the other hand did communicate with the West. Fifteen years after the breach between the East and the West, the two monasteries of S. Dius and S. Bassian in Constantinople, and the mother-house of the Acoemetæ, called the Irenæum, on the opposite shore of the Bosphorus, besides a community of nuns, were still maintaining their separation from S. Macedonius. However, they had returned to Catholic communion before the pacification of Constantinople and Rome in 519. For in the previous year I find that the Archimandrites of the three above-mentioned monasteries joined with the Archimandrites of the other Constantinopolitan monasteries in petitioning the Eastern bishops assembled in the *σύνδοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* at Constantinople to reinsert the names of Euphemius and S. Macedonius in the diptychs. Those names were an abomination to Rome, as they were also an abomination to the Monophysites, but they were rightly dear to Eastern Catholics. In their petition these Archimandrites speak of the Constantinopolitan patriarch as "our most holy archbishop, *the Ecumenical Patriarch, John*" (cf. Coleti, v. 1141, 1144).

¹ See Baronius' notes to the Martyrology, under June 27.

² The Emperor Justin reigned from 518 to 527, and was succeeded by his nephew Justinian.

³ Cf. Du Cange, *Constantinop. Christian.*, iv. B. 114 (*Hist. Byzant.*, ed. Venet., 1729).

⁴ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. v. Jun., p. 264.

commenced during the schism, and there is high authority for the view that he did not live to witness the pacification, which, so far as Constantinople and the exarchate of Thrace were concerned, took place in 519.¹

S. Romanus the Melodist seems to have been the earliest writer of the class of liturgical hymns called *κοντάκια*. He was at first a deacon of the Church of Berytus. Afterwards he took up his abode at Constantinople, and ministered there in the church of the Mother of God, *ἐν τοῖς Κύρου*, where also he was buried, and where his festival was solemnly celebrated. Some critics assign to him the first place among the hymn-writers of the Greek Church. Dr. Neale gives as his date "about A.D. 500."² A question has been raised by a French writer, Bouvy, as to whether S. Romanus' date should not be placed two hundred years later, in the reign of the Emperor Anastasius II. (A.D. 713-716). But the latest investigations have confirmed Dr. Neale's judgement, and appear to have made it clear that S. Romanus flourished in the times of Anastasius I., who reigned from 491 to 518.³

S. Daniel the Stylite was one of the best known of the pillar-saints. He had visited S. Symeon in his youth, and had received his cowl as a legacy. He lived for thirty-three years on a pillar, four miles from Constantinople, and died during the schism, about the year 494. He was attended during his last moments and was buried by the holy patriarch Euphemius, who was out of communion with Rome. Before his death he wrote his dying wishes for his disciples in the form of a will. In this document he says, "Separate never from the Church your mother." Under all the circumstances of the case, we may be sure that he communicated with the church under Euphemius. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology, as well as in the Eastern service-books.⁴

S. Flavian II. of Antioch was patriarch in that city from A.D. 498 to A.D. 512. He was then banished by the persecuting Emperor, Anastasius, to Petra in Arabia, and he died in exile in July, 518. One must suppose that his sanctity was the sanctity of penitence, and that it was developed during the years of his banishment. His conduct during his episcopate was extremely weak and halting. The most interesting point about his history is that, having lived for

¹ But the bishops of the exarchates of Asia and Pontus and of the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem did not come into communion with the West until 521 or 522. See the letter of Epiphanius of Constantinople to Pope Hormisdas (Coleti, v. 669), and the reply of Hormisdas (Coleti, v. 1120-1125).

² See Neale's *General Introduction*, p. 843; and compare Cardinal. Pitr. *Analect. Sacr. Spic. Solesm.*, I. xxv., and the *Analecta Bollandiana*, xiii. 442.

³ See the Abbé Marin's *Moines de Constantinople*, p. 483, note 2.

⁴ Compare Tillemont, xvi. 439-452.

thirty-four years out of communion with Rome, and having died in the same condition, he is nevertheless venerated as a saint by the Roman Church, and his name finds a place in the Roman Martyrology.

The 350 martyrs of Syria Secunda were orthodox monks who were going on pilgrimage to the sanctuary of S. Symeon Stylites, when they were attacked and murdered by a band of assassins, hired by Severus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, and Peter, the Monophysite Metropolitan of Apamea.¹ This took place apparently in the year 517. These martyrs are commemorated in the Roman Martyrology, and Baronius asserts that they were in the Roman communion when they died.² I hope to show, in an Appendix, that that is a mistake.³

S. Theodosius the Coenobiarch was the superior of all the coenobites, who lived under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. He was a most ardent champion of the true doctrine of the Incarnation and of the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, and on that account he was banished by Anastasius. Two lives of him have come down to us, one by Cyril of Scythopolis, the other by Theodore, Bishop of Petra, who had been his disciple. He is credited with miraculous and prophetic gifts. Baronius calls him, "the celebrated Theodosius, great in name and illustrious in deeds;"⁴ he also describes him as "most holy."⁵ He was out of communion with Rome from the age of sixty-one to the age of ninety-eight. He lived to the age of one hundred and six, so that he survived the reunion of the patriarchate of Jerusalem with the West eight years.

S. Gabriel the Archimandrite was one of the disciples of S. Euthymius the Great. He became Abbot of S. Stephen's monastery at Jerusalem, and died there, out of communion with Rome, in the year 490. His feast is celebrated on January 26.

S. Cyriacus the Anchorite was ordained deacon at the age of thirty-six, in the year 484, the very year when the breach of communion between the East and the West took place. He had already been nineteen years living the monastic life. He was ordained priest at the age of fifty-two, in the year 500, in the middle period of the schism. Baronius applies to him the epithet of "*sanctissimus*."⁶ He was out of communion with Rome from the age of thirty-six to the age of

¹ Apamea was the metropolis of Syria Secunda.

² *Annal. Eccl.*, s.a. 517, tom. vi. p. 694, edit. 1658.

³ See Appendix K, pp. 418-421.

⁴ *Annal. Eccl.*, s.a. 511, tom. vi. pp. 617, 618, edit. 1658.

⁵ *Ibid.*, s.a. 491, tom. vi. p. 468.

⁶ *Ibid.*

seventy-three. He died at the age of one hundred and eight, in the year 556. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on September 29.

S. John the Chuzibite was one of the wonder-working saints. He was a disciple of S. Sabas, and was illustrious for his sanctity and miracles in the laura of Chuziba. John Moschus, in the *Pratum Spirituale* (cap. 25), tells how, when S. John was abbot of that laura, he was accustomed to see some visible token of the descent of the Holy Ghost at the consecration of the Holy Eucharist. There is also an account of one of his miracles in Evagrius' History.¹ Before the pacification of the Church he had ceased to be abbot of his laura, and had become Bishop of Caesarea, and in that capacity took part in the synod at Jerusalem, which was held in the year 518.² All the members of that synod were out of communion with Rome. He wrote a defence of the faith of Chalcedon.

S. Zosimas the Wonder-worker was a friend of S. John the Chuzibite, and like him was endowed with the gifts of prophecy and miracles. Evagrius recounts several instances of the saint's exercise of these gifts.³ In one of these S. John the Chuzibite took part; and from the fact of S. Zosimas speaking of him on that occasion as "the Chuzibite," one would suppose that it took place before S. John's elevation to the episcopate. On the other hand, S. John was at Caesarea when this miracle was worked, and that fact may indicate that he had already become Bishop of Caesarea.⁴ If the miracle was worked before S. John's consecration, S. Zosimas' thaumaturgic powers must have been developed when he was out of communion with Rome. If it took place afterwards, the point must remain doubtful. S. Zosimas is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on November 30.

S. Sabas the Great was, as Alban Butler truly says, "one of the most renowned patriarchs of the monks of Palestine." He was the superior general of the anchorites who lived under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, just as S. Theodosius the Coenobiarch was the superior of the coenobites in the same region. The details of his wonderful and most edifying life have been preserved for us by Cyril of

¹ *H. E.*, iv. 7.

² *Acta SS.*, tom. xii. Octobr., p. 587 *seqq.*

³ *H. E.*, iv. 7.

⁴ S. Zosimas himself was abbot of a monastery at a place sixty miles away from Caesarea, yet he used to visit that city; so there is no reason why S. John, when he was Abbot of Chuziba, may not have done the same. The fact that he was elected to the see of Caesarea might tend to show that he was known to the clergy and to the faithful of the place, and that he had therefore visited it, when he was an abbot. [But I see now that Evagrius makes it quite clear that, when the miracle was wrought, John was already a bishop.]

Scythopolis, his biographer; and the English reader may study them in the pages of Alban Butler. S. Sabas was out of communion with Rome from the time that he was forty-five to the time that he was eighty-two, and it was during those years that the most striking events of his life happened, and that his most heroic deeds were accomplished. The Roman Martyrology says of him, "He shone out as a wonderful example of sanctity in Palestine, and he laboured strenuously for the Catholic faith against those who impugned the holy Council of Chalcedon." Those strenuous labours belong to the period when, according to the teaching of Cardinal Wiseman, he was living in schism. He died in the year 532, at the age of ninety-three. A church and monastery were built at Rome in his honour; and the monastery, which he himself founded in the wildest part of the rocky desert to the west of the Dead Sea, is visited to this day by most travellers in Palestine.

S. John the Silentiary was born in the year 454. He became Bishop of Colonia, in the province of Armenia Prima, in 481. He resigned his see in 491, and lived as an anchorite in Palestine until his death in 558. He was out of communion with Rome from the age of thirty to the age of sixty-seven. He lived to be one hundred and four. Some of the most remarkable events of his life and some of his most wonderful miracles took place while he was out of communion with Rome. Cyril of Scythopolis, who knew him, wrote his life in the year before he died. The Eastern Church keeps his feast on the 8th of December, but his name occurs in the Roman Martyrology on the 13th of May.

I have reserved for the last the saints of the patriarchate of Alexandria, because of the peculiar circumstances of that patriarchate during the time of the schism. Between the years 482 and 538 the patriarchs of Alexandria were all of them Monophysites. Nevertheless, both the orthodox Church of the East and also the Latin Church celebrate the memories of S. Aretas and the martyrs of Najrân in Southern Arabia, and also of S. Elesbaan, the King of Ethiopia. It seems most unlikely that these persons would have been venerated as saints if they had been Monophysites, and yet it is difficult to clear them of having lived in communion with Timothy III., Patriarch of Alexandria from 520 to 537, who certainly was a Monophysite. All that can be said is, that at any rate in the earlier years of his episcopate Timothy may have concealed his Monophysite belief.¹ That he was in fact a Monophysite has been proved by the discovery of a treatise written by him

¹ The earlier years of Timothy's episcopate coincided with the reign of the Emperor Justin, who was very much opposed to Monophysitism.

against the Council of Chalcedon, among the Syriac MSS. of the British Museum.¹

S. Aretas and the martyrs of Najrân were put to death by orders of the Jewish king of the Homeritæ, Dhu'n Navvâs, in the year 522 (or 523), in a manner so cruel that the memory of it is preserved in the Koran,² written a hundred years later. The number of martyrs was altogether 4252, as is mentioned in the acts of their martyrdom. Out of this great number, S. Aretas, the governor of the city, and 340 of the chief men are commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on October 24. The memory of the others is celebrated on July 27. There seems to be no doubt that these Arabian Christians acknowledged the Bishop of Alexandria as their patriarch;³ nevertheless the Bollandist, Father Carpentier, stoutly maintains that they were not themselves tainted with heresy.⁴ I am quite ready to believe that he is right, though the question is surrounded with difficulties. There can, however, be no difficulty in deciding that they were out of communion with Rome. Timothy of Alexandria may have concealed his Monophysitism from fear of the Emperor,⁵ but he did not share in the general pacification of the Church, which took place in the years 519-521. When Pope John I. came to Constantinople in the year 525, he said Mass in Latin on Easter Day, and communicated with all the bishops of the East *except Timothy of Alexandria*.⁶ The Acts of S. Aretas tell us that during the Eastertide of that very year "the most blessed Bishop Timothy, having assembled in the church of the holy Apostle Mark all the orthodox and a multitude of monks from Nitria and Scete, decreed that there should be a day of intercession,⁷ and celebrated a vigil, and on the morrow, when he had concluded the Eucharistic service, he placed the Divine Oblation in a silver vessel, and sent it by a presbyter to the King of the Ethiopians,"⁸ that is, to S. Elesbaan, and exhorted him to go and lead his army against the wicked tyrant Dhu'n Navvâs.

I must not dwell any longer on these Alexandrine saints, but must refer the reader to Father Carpentier's disquisitions on S. Elesbaan and also on S. Pantaleon and his eight

¹ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. x. Octobr., pp. 710, 711.

² In the Sûrah of the Zodiacal signs, the 85th.

³ *Acta SS.*, tom. x. Octobr., p. 713.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 695, 701, 713.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 711; et tom. xii. pp. 317, 319.

⁶ Cf. Pagi, *Critica*, ii. 525, edit. 1727.

⁷ ἐκθύρῃε λιτανεῖαν: the word λιτανεῖα may mean a litany, or a procession, or a supplication. This public service of intercession for S. Elesbaan took place at Alexandria, in April, 525. Easter Day fell that year on March 30 (cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. xii. Octobr., p. 319).

⁸ *Acta SS.*, tom. x. Octobr., p. 743.

companions in the twelfth volume of the Bollandist October. I lay less stress on the Alexandrine saints than on those of the other patriarchates, because they lived in a barbarous country, and there is considerable uncertainty about their orthodoxy.¹ S. Macedonius and S. Elias and S. Flavian II. sat on the great patriarchal thrones of Christendom, and knew perfectly well that they themselves were out of communion with Rome, and that, as patriarchs, they were responsible for the separation of the whole East from Rome; and S. Sabas and S. Theodosius and S. John the Silentiary are among the shining lights who rendered illustrious the lauras and monasteries of Palestine. The united testimony of these and of others like them, of whom I have spoken, proves conclusively that the saints of the Eastern Church, in the time of the Acacian troubles, knew nothing of Cardinal Wiseman's doctrine that "it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the see of Rome and who are not." Pope Gelasius probably did hold something of this sort; for, as we have seen, he compelled the ex-legate Misenus to "strike with an everlasting anathema" Acacius and his successors and "all those who follow and communicate with them;" and it was only on condition of Misenus doing this that the pope restored him to communion and to his episcopal see.² But we for our part wholly decline to accept the witness of the popes in their own favour. We have in this case the popes on one side, and a large body of saints on the other, and we feel that it is safer to follow the saints; and the more so because the saints were handing on the traditional teaching of the Church. The mantles of S. Cyprian and of S. Basil and of S. Chrysostom had fallen upon them.

The reader will naturally want to know how this Acacian trouble came to an end. It would take too long to go into the matter fully, but I will give a brief account of how it came about.

The persecuting Emperor, Anastasius, died in July, 518. He was succeeded by Justin, who had risen from the ranks. Justin was a rough soldier, who could neither read nor write, but he had one great advantage over his predecessor, in that

¹ But it must be remembered that Romanists cannot object to their evidence being brought forward, because the Roman Church commemorates them as saints. I refer to S. Aretas and other martyrs of Najrân, and to S. Elesbaan.

² See pp. 383, 384. Tillemont (xvi. 658), when he describes Misenus' curses against those who communicated with Acacius, says very truly, "That is to say, he cursed more than half the Church, and among others S. Sabas, S. Theodosius, S. Daniel the Stylite, S. Elias of Jerusalem, etc. That is terrible!" It is indeed terrible, but it is the natural outcome of Gelasian principles.

he was fervently attached to the Catholic faith. At that time John the Cappadocian was Patriarch of Constantinople. He had succeeded the Monophysite Timothy,¹ who had been intruded into the see by Anastasius when S. Macedonius was banished.² During the whole of Timothy's episcopate the faithful people of Constantinople, who had been well trained in orthodoxy by their holy patriarchs Euphemius and S. Macedonius, refused to communicate with the heretical intruder. Their joy was great when Justin came to the throne; and on the Sunday following they flocked to the church, and when the Patriarch John and the rest of the clergy entered, a strange proceeding took place. The congregation burst into acclamations, which lasted for hours. "Long live the Emperor!" they said: "Long live the Empress!" "Long live the patriarch!" "Thou art orthodox. Of whom art thou afraid?" "Why do we remain without communion?" "Why have we not communicated for so many years?" "We wish to communicate from thy hands!" "Let the holy synod [of Chalcedon] be put on the diptychs!" "An orthodox Emperor reigns, whom dost thou fear?" "The faith of the orthodox people is conquering!" "Long live the new Constantine!" "Long live the new Helena!" "Bring back the relics of Macedonius at once!" "Restore the relics of Macedonius to the church!" "Let the names of Euphemius and Macedonius be given a place at once!" "Put the four [ecumenical] synods on the diptychs!" "Put Leo the Bishop of Rome on the diptychs!" "Long live the orthodox Emperor!" "Bring the diptychs at once!"³ There is a curious record of all these acclamations, which was solemnly read out before the important Council of Constantinople, at which S. Mennas presided in the year 536. The record goes on to say, "Then the most holy and most blessed Archbishop and Ecumenical Patriarch John, receiving the diptychs, ordered the four holy synods to be entered, . . . and also the names of Euphemius and Macedonius of holy memory, the defunct Archbishops of this Imperial City, and also the name of Leo, who was Archbishop of Rome. Then with a great voice all the people, as with one mouth, exclaimed, 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people;'"⁴ and so at last the patriarch was able to accomplish the holy service of the altar.

Thus, after a period of unsatisfactory vacillation in regard to the faith, brought about by the intrusion of the heretic

¹ Timothy removed from the diptychs the names of Euphemius and of S. Macedonius, and also the entries referring to the Council of Chalcedon and to S. Leo, the author of the *Tome*.

² See p. 387.

³ I have given merely a selection from the long list of acclamations.

⁴ Coleti, v. 1148-1156.

Timothy, the Church of Constantinople was happily restored to orthodoxy;¹ but it was still out of communion with Rome. However, the new Emperor was quite determined that the whole Church throughout his empire should be bound together in a fellowship which should be visibly one. He therefore wrote to Pope Hormisdas, and the Patriarch John also wrote. Hormisdas replied cordially, but made it quite clear that, if the East wished to be in communion with the West, the name of Acacius and the names of his *sequaces* must be expunged, and a certain formulary (*libellus*), which had been sent from Rome to Constantinople in the time of the Emperor Anastasius, must be signed. In the following year (A.D. 519) legates arrived from Rome, bringing this formulary with them. It contained a very high-flying statement of Hormisdas' claims on behalf of his see, such a statement as no Eastern bishop or saint had ever signed before. It is only fair that the most important clauses of this formulary should be set forth in full. The words are, of course, the pope's words; but he requires the Eastern bishops to sign them, if they wish to be admitted to his communion. The formulary, as it was signed by the Patriarch John, runs as follows: "The first point of salvation is, that we should keep the rule of right faith, and in no way deviate from the tradition of the Fathers: because it is not possible to pass over the determination of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church.' These words are proved by their effects, for in the apostolic see the Catholic religion is always kept inviolable.² Wishing, therefore, not to fall from this faith,

¹ It will be remembered that the great body of the Church had remained orthodox all along, but a heretical Emperor had intruded a heretical bishop into the see.

² This was a dangerous argument to use. It may be doubted whether Hormisdas would have inserted this clause if he could have foreseen that one of his successors, S. Leo II., would in the year 683 write to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus concerning Pope Honorius as follows: "We anathematize Honorius, who, instead of labouring to keep this apostolic Church pure by the teaching of apostolic tradition, suffered it, the immaculate, to be polluted through his profane betrayal," or, as the last words run in the Latin form of the epistle, "attempted to subvert the immaculate faith by a profane betrayal" (Coleti, vii. 1156). The same Pope S. Leo II., having included his predecessor Honorius in a list of heretics, says, "All these, preaching one will and one operation in the Godhead and Manhood of our Lord Jesus Christ, *impudently attempted to defend heretical doctrine*" (*Ep. Leonis Papae II. ad Ervigium regem Hispaniae*, ap. Coleti, vii. 1462). It is important to remember that, according to the teaching of the popes, they themselves are liable "to defend heretical doctrine in an impudent manner." This teaching was faithfully handed down in the Roman see; and so we find that Pope Adrian VI. in his *Quaestiones de Sacramentis in quartum Sententiarum librum* (fol. xxvi. coll. iii., iv.), when treating of the minister of Confirmation, discusses the question, "Utrum papa possit errare in his quae tangunt fidem?" He replies, "Dico primo quod si per ecclesiam Romanam intelligat caput ejus, puta pontifex, certum est quod possit errare, etiam in iis quae tangunt fidem, haeresim per suam determinationem aut decretalem asserendo. Plures enim fuerunt pontifices Romani haeretici." I quote from the

and following in all things the ordinances of the Fathers, we anathematize all heresies, but especially the heretic Nestorius, . . . and together with him we anathematize Eutyches and Dioscorus, . . . who were condemned in the holy Council of Chalcedon, which we venerate and follow and embrace ; . . . joining him to these, we anathematize Timothy the parricide, surnamed the Cat, and similarly condemning his disciple and follower in all things, Peter [Mongus] of Alexandria, we similarly anathematize Acacius, formerly Bishop of Constantinople, who became their accomplice and follower, and those, moreover, who persevere in their communion and fellowship : for if any one embraces the communion of these persons, he falls under a similar judgement of condemnation with them. In like manner we also condemn and anathematize Peter of Antioch with his followers and with all those who have been mentioned above.¹ Wherefore we approve and embrace all the epistles of blessed Leo, Pope of the city of Rome, which he wrote concerning the right faith. On which account, as we have said before, following in all things the apostolic see, we preach all things, which have been by her decreed ; and consequently I hope that I shall be in one communion with you, the communion which the apostolic see preaches, in which is the whole and perfect entirety (*soliditas*) of the Christian religion, promising for the future that at the celebration of the holy mysteries there shall be no mention made of the names of those who have been separated from the communion of the Catholic Church—that is, of those who do not agree in all things with the apostolic see. . . .”² The Patriarch John knew well that the Emperor was determined that the Church of Constantinople should come into communion with the Church of Rome. His own record was not one that could bear investigation, nor had he any large share in the courage and firmness of the saints. He had been syncellus or confidential chaplain to his heretical predecessor ; and he had been appointed to his present exalted position by the heretical Emperor Anastasius, who had compelled him to anathematize the Council of Chalcedon, as the price to be paid for his elevation to the patriarchate. In the present conjuncture he knew that, if he was to retain his see, he must sign the Roman formulary ; but, poor-spirited as he was, he was not prepared

edition published by Pope Adrian in 1522 during his pontificate, under his own eye at Rome. It must be remembered that Acacius had never explicitly “defended heretical doctrine,” as Honorius did, nor asserted heresy in a decretal, as other popes did.

¹ This is the clause which was modified by the papal legates, so as to save the Patriarch John from the indignity of having to anathematize his predecessors, Euphemius and S. Macedonius (see pp. 416, 417).

² *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* clix. §§ 3-6, pp. 608, 609.

to sign it as it stood. He insisted on prefacing it by a preamble. After the usual compliments to his "brother and fellow-minister" Hormisdas, he says, "When I received your letter, I rejoiced at the spiritual charity of your holiness, because you are seeking to unite the most holy churches of God according to the ancient tradition of the Fathers, and in the spirit of Christ you are hastening to drive away those who have been tearing the rational flock. Know therefore, most holy one, that . . . I too, loving peace, renounce all the heretics repudiated by thee: *for I hold the most holy churches of your elder and of our new Rome to be one church; I define that see of the Apostle Peter and this of the imperial city to be one see.*"¹ Then he expresses his complete assent to everything that was done at the four Ecumenical Councils, concerning the confirmation of the faith and the state of the Church, and denounces all disturbers of the same, and then proceeds to adopt and make his own the words of the papal formulary. It will be noticed that by means of this preamble the Patriarch John managed to blunt very considerably the edge of the formulary; for, by identifying in some curious fashion his own see of new Rome with the papal see of old Rome, he managed to claim for the Constantinopolitan see a share in all the special privileges which in the formulary were assigned to the Western apostolic chair. However, the document, as modified by the patriarch, was accepted by the legates, and intercommunion was once more established between Rome and Constantinople. Rome could congratulate herself on having won a very substantial victory, in so far as the Patriarch anathematized Acacius and struck his name out of the Constantinopolitan diptychs. Rome also won for a time another victory, which was less to her credit. By command of the pope,² the legates, while they did not insist on Euphemius and S. Macedonius being anathematized, did require that their names should be removed like that of Acacius from the diptychs. Those names had been triumphantly replaced a few months before, namely, on the day of the great acclamations. However, as part of the price to be paid for the reunion of the Church, they were now once more removed. But, as has been already stated,³ no long time elapsed before they were again replaced; and since then S. Macedonius has been reckoned by the Constantinopolitan Church as one of the saints, and venerated accordingly.⁴

The formulary, which the legates had brought, was signed

¹ *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* clix. §§ 1, 2, pp. 607, 608.

² Cf. Coleti, v. 613.

³ See p. 388.

⁴ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. iii. April., p. 373.

not only by the Patriarch John, but also by the other bishops who happened to be in Constantinople at that time. It was probably signed by all, or almost all, the bishops of Thrace, and by some of those in Pontus and Asia. But Justinian, the Emperor Justin's nephew, wrote to the pope in the year 520, that "a considerable part of the Eastern bishops¹ could not be compelled, even by the use of fire and sword, to condemn the names of the bishops who died after Acacius." Incidentally we learn from this passage what sort of pressure was put upon the bishops to compel them to accept the Roman demands. The Patriarch Epiphanius, who had succeeded John the Cappadocian, wrote at the same time to Hormisdas, and told him that "very many of the holy bishops of Pontus and Asia, and, above all, those of the circumscription of the *Oriens*, found it to be difficult and even impossible to expunge the names of their former bishops," and "that they were prepared to brave every danger rather than do such a deed." Consequently, Epiphanius recommends the pope to follow "the pathway of humility" in his effort to reunite the Church.² The Emperor Justin also wrote to much the same effect, and speaks of "the threats and persuasions" used to induce the clergy and laity of these dioceses to agree to the removal of the names; but "they," he says, "esteem life harder than death, if they should condemn those, when dead, whose life, when they were alive, was their people's glory." Then he urges the pope to abate his demands, "in order to unite everywhere the venerable churches, and especially the Church of Jerusalem, on which church all bestow their good will, as being the mother of the Christian name, so that no one dares to separate himself from that church."³ The pope, in his answer to the Emperor, urges him to use force to compel uniformity.⁴ He at the same time wrote to the Patriarch Epiphanius, empowering him to represent himself, so that whoever was admitted to communion with the Church of Constantinople was to be reckoned as being in communion with the Church of Rome. He also begs Epiphanius to send him a list of those whom he shall thus admit, and to state the contents of the declaration of faith which each should make on his reception;⁵ and he inserts a concise statement

¹ "Pars orientaliū non exilis" (Coleti, v. 667, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxvii. § 3, p. 655).

² Coleti, v. 669, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxiii. §§ 5, 6, p. 708.

³ *Ibid.*, v. 672, 673, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxii. §§ 3, 8, pp. 701, 703. Justin is speaking here, not of the Christians of Palestine only, but of the Catholics residing in the different provinces of his empire, who all desired, and with good reason, to remain in communion with the mother-church of Jerusalem.

⁴ *Ibid.*, v. 681, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxviii. §§ 10, 11, p. 736.

⁵ *Ibid.*, v. 1121, 1122, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxvii. § 6, pp. 726, 728.

of doctrine, the substance of which is to be enforced on all who are received. This statement of doctrine has reference to our Lord's Incarnation and to the Church's teaching about the Trinity, and there is nothing in it bearing on the prerogatives of the see of Rome.¹ So it came to pass that in the end the pope receded from the extreme claims which he had made at first, and left the whole matter practically in the hands of Epiphanius. The larger part of the Eastern Church was admitted back into communion with the West on its own terms, rather than on the pope's terms.² The Eastern bishops had all along been ready to give pledges of the orthodoxy of their faith;³ but they had rightly refused to give way by subjection to the usurping claims of the Roman see. Throughout the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, and in the greater part of the exarchates of Pontus and Asia, the names of Euphemius, and of S. Macedonius, and of the other orthodox bishops, who had communicated with the name and memory of Acacius, and who had died during the schism under the anathema of Rome, were never expunged from the diptychs, and the bishops seem to have escaped the necessity of appending their signatures to the obnoxious formulary of Hormisdas.⁴ We are indeed told by Father Bottalla⁵ that "all the bishops of the Eastern Church, with their patriarchs and their Emperor, signed the formula of union, amidst shouts and tears of universal joy;" and by "the formula of union" Father Bottalla means the original formulary of Hormisdas. He goes on to say that "this precious document of the faith of the East, signed by all the patriarchs, and accepted, of course, by the whole Western Church, has a weight of authority not less than that of a definition of faith pronounced by an Ecumenical Council." This passage is thoroughly characteristic of the over-confident and reckless way in which history is written by some Ultramontane controversialists. As we have seen, instead of the formula having been signed by "all the bishops of the Eastern Church," it was probably signed by about half the bishops of one out of the four Eastern patriarchates; the patriarch

¹ Coleti, v. 1123, 1124, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxvii. §§ 9, 10, 11, pp. 728, 730.

² Except that Acacius was anathematized, and his name was removed from the diptychs.

³ I except, of course, the patriarchate of Alexandria, which had been cut off from the communion of the Church of Constantinople by Euphemius in the year 490, and was still given over to Monophysite misbelief. The see of Alexandria was not admitted back into fellowship with the rest of the Church until the consecration of the Patriarch Paul by S. Mennas of Constantinople in A.D. 538.

⁴ On the fact that many Eastern bishops were admitted to the communion of Hormisdas without signing his *libellus*, see Appendix L, pp. 421-424.

⁵ *Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 115.

himself refusing to sign it, until he had prefixed a preamble which considerably blunted its point. And, again, instead of the formulary being "a precious document of the faith of the East," it was drawn up by the pope, and was pressed upon the East by the Emperor with threats of fire and sword; and yet, notwithstanding those threats, it was probably rejected by the majority of the Eastern bishops. Even if it were certain that it had been signed by them all, it would be ludicrous to compare the authority of such a document so signed with the authority of "a definition of faith pronounced by an Ecumenical Council." The formulary had not been synodically accepted in a free council, and therefore did not bind future generations. Each bishop, who freely signed, was personally bound by his own signature, but he could not bind his successors. The Church's laws, whether dogmatic or disciplinary, are not made in such a fashion as that. To crown his other enormities, Father Bottalla informs us in the note that "Rusticus—who wrote under Justinian, the successor of Justin—says that the formulary of Hormisdas was signed by 2500 priests (*sacerdotes*, bishops) of the Eastern Church." Rusticus says nothing of the kind. What he does say is that the Council of Chalcedon was "an Ecumenical Synod, which has often been confirmed by the harmonious judgement of all the churches, not only by the encyclical letters¹ [of various patriarchal and provincial councils] in the reign of [the Emperor] Leo, but also by the *libelli* (professions of faith) of perhaps 2500 bishops in the reign of the Emperor Justin, after the schism of Peter [Mongus] of Alexandria and of Acacius of Constantinople."² Rusticus is no doubt right when he says that all these 2500 *libelli* contained an explicit acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon; but he nowhere identifies these *libelli* with the original formulary of Hormisdas, nor does he suggest that they were all worded in accordance with one pattern. If he had committed himself to either of these statements, he would have come into collision with our contemporary sources of information; as it is, his testimony harmonizes completely with the whole body of facts which has reached us through other channels.

Here I must bring to a conclusion what I propose to say at the present time on the subject of the Acacian troubles. To my mind the history of those troubles shows clearly that the great Eastern saints of the fifth and sixth centuries had no conception of the papacy as the divinely appointed and necessary centre of communion. If they really thought that

¹ These are, I imagine, the synodical letters printed by Coleti (iv. 1834-1934); they are, for the most part, addressed to the Emperor Leo.

² Rustic. *contra Acephalos Disputat.*, P.L., lxvii. 1251.

to be out of communion with the pope was equivalent to being out of communion with the Catholic Church, one would be bound to say that their actions would prove that they were very wicked men. On that *hypothesis*, they were content to remain outside the Church for thirty-five or thirty-seven years. Nay, more; some of them were content to die in that appalling condition. No one, who knows anything of primitive theology, could suppose that S. Macedonius and S. Elias and S. Sabas and their brethren held the common Protestant notion that it does not matter whether you are in the Church or out of it. Assuredly they believed, as every one believed, that "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*" If, therefore, they supposed that the Church was restricted to that body of persons who were for the time being in communion with the pope, they manifested a most culpable carelessness about their salvation, seeing that they took no pains to get back into the Catholic unity. Let those who choose to do so throw mud at those holy men. I, for my part, entirely disbelieve in the theory of their wickedness; but that is equivalent to saying that I entirely disbelieve in the notion that they accepted the modern Roman teaching about the relation of the papacy to the unity of the Church.

I should much like to pursue the history of the Church Catholic and of the Roman see through the century which followed the pontificate of Hormisdas. One would have to tell of how the great and illustrious Church of North Africa, meeting in council under the presidency of Reparatus of Carthage, "synodically separated Vigilius, the Roman bishop, the condemner of the three chapters, from Catholic communion, reserving however to him a place of repentance;"¹ and of how, in February, 552, S. Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, anathematized the same Pope Vigilius, and was himself anathematized by the pope.² The two prelates were reconciled in the following June; and two months afterwards S. Mennas died in the odour of sanctity; he is venerated as a saint by the Roman Church on August 25. One would have to narrate the very remarkable proceedings of S. Eutychius of Constantinople and the Fifth Ecumenical Council; of how it anathematized the person as well as the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and also

¹ This was in A.D. 550 (cf. Coleti, v. 1395, 1396). Surely the mere fact that a Western Church like the African could act in this way, is proof positive that the papal theory was unknown in that age to the Church at large. On that theory such action would have been suicidal.

² Dom Coustant, in his *Dissertatio de Vigilii Papae Gestis*, § 88, ap. Cardin. Pitr. *Analect. Novissim. Spic. Solesm.*, tom. i. p. 427, says, "Nobis autem non displicet quod Theophanes de mutuo Vigilii in Menam, et Menae in Vigilium anathemate scribit."

certain writings of Ibas and of Theodoret; although it must have known well that it was acting in defiance of the wishes of Pope Vigilius, who, though he was in Constantinople at the time, refused to come to the council. One would have to tell how for six months the pope refused his assent to what had been done by the council, but at last, in a letter to S. Eutychius, confessed that it was the devil who had deceived him, and led him to despise brotherly charity, so that he was carried away into discord, but now he wishes to retract his former opposition, and to condemn Theodore of Mopsuestia, and such writings of the same Theodore and of Ibas and of Theodoret as had been condemned by the council.¹ One would have to narrate the history of the dissensions which arose in the West in consequence of Vigilius having assented to the decrees of the Fifth Council; of how the bishops of Tuscany, Liguria, Venetia, and Histria withdrew from communion with the Roman see; and of how the province of Aquileia remained out of communion with the pope for nearly one hundred and fifty years.² One would have to point out that many who then lived and died outside the Roman communion, have since been reckoned among the saints. To give one instance, ten bishops of Como,³ who were never in communion with the pope, are venerated as saints by the Church of Como to this day, and this veneration has been sanctioned by the Congregation of Rites. One might go on to quote the celebrated letter of the glorious missionary, S. Columbanus, to Pope Boniface IV., in which he justifies the refusal of many of the bishops of North Italy to communicate with the papal chair. It is true that S. Columbanus makes some mistakes in his historical statements; but the principles which he lays down show that he had no notion of accepting the papal theory.⁴ But, interesting as these subjects are, I must resist the temptation to discuss them. Enough has been said, I think, to show that Cardinal Wiseman committed a rash act when he appealed to "the doctrine of the ancient Fathers"⁵ in favour of his theory, that "it is

¹ Coleti, vi. 239-246.

² From A.D. 557 to A.D. 698.

³ These ten bishops' names are these: S. Flavian I. (Feb. 26); S. Adalbert (June 3); S. Agrippinus (June 17); S. Martinianus (Sept. 3); S. John II. (Oct. 3); S. John III. (Oct. 20); S. Octavianus (Oct. 23); S. Benedictus (Oct. 30); S. Flavian II. (Nov. 26); S. Rubianus (Dec. 16); cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. x. Octobr., pp. 106-108.

⁴ He says to the pope in one passage of his letter, "Rightly do your juniors resist you, and rightly do they refuse to communicate with you" (*Ep. v. ad Bonifacium Papam IV.* § ix., *P. L.*, lxxx. 279).

⁵ According to the teaching of some modern Romanist writers, it would seem to be a very needless proceeding to take any pains to learn what "the doctrine of

easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic, and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the see of Rome, and who are not."¹

No! the ancient Fathers taught a doctrine concerning the distinction between Catholics and schismatics, and concerning the true nature of the unity of the Church, which differs very widely from the teaching of the Vatican Council and of Cardinal Wiseman. In ancient times, if the question arose, Is such and such a bishop a prelate of the Catholic Church? various points would have to be investigated before an answer could be given. It would have to be considered whether the bishop had been validly ordained in the line of the apostolical succession; whether the faith which he publicly professed was in agreement with the doctrinal tradition of the Church; whether he was the canonical occupant of his see; whether the see itself had been canonically erected.² These would seem to be the principal questions which would need to be satisfactorily answered in such a case. It is quite certain that the mere fact of being in communion with the pope or out of communion with the pope would in no way be a certain test of a bishop's *status*. S. Meletius was out of communion with Damasus, yet his people constituted "*the true Church of God*" at Antioch.³ Paulinus and Evagrius were in communion with Rome, yet their position was illegitimate; they had "*illegally mounted the throne*;" their partisans were guilty of "*dividing the Church*."⁴

According to the teaching of the Fathers, the true canonical bishops of the Catholic Church constituted a college, of which Christ our Lord was the one and only Head. If they, as a whole, were looking to Him, and depending on Him, He was able and willing to safeguard the visible unity of the episcopal body. If their faith in

the ancient Fathers" was. The notion, favoured by these writers, appears to be, that by pronouncing the magic word "development" the defenders of their church are freed from the necessity of tracing back the substance of her creed to primitive times. Fortunately, the Roman Church herself has never committed herself to a theory so profoundly anti-Catholic and anti-Christian. May the day never come, when so large a division of Christendom shall, by adopting so fundamental an error, break with its own tradition and with the faith once delivered to the saints. On the general subject of doctrinal development, see Appendix M, pp. 424-433.

¹ See p. 216.

² Of course Cardinal Wiseman would agree as to the necessity of these requirements being fulfilled. But he would hold that, normally, canonicity of status would be guaranteed by the fact of being recognized by the pope, and that apart from such recognition canonicity of status is an impossibility.

³ S. Basil. *Ep.* ccciv., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 321, and see above on p. 321.

⁴ S. Chrys. *Hom.* xi. in *Épist. ad Ephes.*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., xi. 86, 89, and see above, on pp. 369, 370.

their invisible Head failed, if they began to put their trust in secular princes or in an ecclesiastical monarch of their own creating, they ran the risk of experiencing the withdrawal of the Lord's hand, and of losing, at any rate for a time, the precious gift of visible unity. Even so, each separate section of the canonical episcopate remained united to our Lord, and through Him, and through the common faith and the fundamental institutions of the Church, retained an organic union with the other sections. The essential unity remained, though the visible unity, in so far as it depends on intercommunion, was in abeyance. Even in our present divided condition the Lord still governs His Church, and through her begets new children, and feeds and guides those whom He has begotten; but how miserably weakened is the divided Church's witness in the face of the unbelieving world, and how feeble is her use of her supernatural weapons in her warfare with Satan and his spiritual hosts of wickedness! Assuredly, if we long for the restoration of the Church to her ancient spiritual glory, we must yearn for the restoration of her visible unity. For this we must pray, for this we must work. But that unity can only be restored in accordance with the institution of Christ. If we could have a perfect unity by some human device of our own, by building up a papacy into a great tower of Babel, to prevent our being "scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth,"¹ it would but result in an increase of confusion. The Church can be united under Christ's Headship, and under His only. He has not chosen to appoint one great ecclesiastical potentate as His vicar, to represent His Headship over the Church. Each bishop is Christ's vicar for the diocese over which he presides; but for the whole Church the Invisible Head appoints an Invisible Vicar,² even the Holy Ghost, whose principal instrument in the external government of the Church is the collective episcopate. Therefore the only way which will really lead towards a restoration of visible unity, is a more complete subjection of the bishops to the Holy Ghost. We ought to pray for a great outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon the whole of the Catholic episcopate, that so in all parts of the Church the rust of party-spirit and prejudice and ignorance and worldliness and ambition may be purged away, and by the mysterious unifying power of the Spirit,

¹ Gen. xi. 4.

² Tertullian (*de Praescript. Haeret.*, cap. xxviii.) and S. Jerome (*Hom.* xxii. in *Luc.*, *P. L.*, xxvi. 268) both call the Holy Ghost the Vicar of Christ. S. Jerome says, "When the Lord Jesus came, and sent the Holy Ghost, His Vicar (*Vicarium Suum*), every valley was exalted." Compare S. John xiv. 16, and see S. Hilar. Pictav. *Epist. seu Libell.* § vi. (*P. L.*, x. 739).

those who have long been severed may be drawn together, and obstacles to unity may be removed, and the attraction of love may bind and unite, and the whole body of the Church's rulers may look up to Christ in faith and trust, and from Him receive their impulse and direction. May our Lord hasten this in His own time.

We know not whether it is our Lord's purpose to accomplish this unifying work before His return. It may be that, in punishment for His people's sins, the visible unity of the Church will remain suspended until the Church herself has been purged through the fires of the last great persecution, which shall be in the days of Antichrist. It may be that the outpouring of the Spirit will not be granted until Israel "shall turn to the Lord," when "the veil is taken away."¹ It may be that the prophecies of the conversion of the world shall find their fulfilment in that new order of things, which shall issue out of Christ's "appearing and kingdom,"² when the nations shall be ruled with a rod of iron by the saints who have overcome,³ and who have been caught up to be with our Lord.⁴ We must not venture to be over-confident in regard to the sequence of future events. But we know that all God's promises shall be wonderfully fulfilled in due season. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but His words shall not pass away. Ultimately "the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall the Lord be one, and His Name one."⁵ Ultimately "all flesh shall come to worship before Me, saith the Lord."⁶ Ultimately the world shall believe that the Father sent the Son, because the followers of Christ, who believe in Him through the apostolic word, shall be "perfected into one."⁷

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 16.

³ Rev. ii. 26, 27.

⁵ Zech. xiv. 9.

² 2 Tim. iv. 1.

⁴ 1 Thess. iv. 17.

⁶ Isa. lxvi. 23.

⁷ Cf. S. John xvii. 20-23.

APPENDIX J.

On the completeness of the breach of communion between the East and the West during the period of the Acacian troubles (see p. 383).

DR. RIVINGTON in an article on the *Acacian Troubles*, which was published in the *Dublin Review*, tried hard to show that during the period of those troubles there was no breach of communion between the East and the West, or that at any rate any breach, which there may have been, was not a complete breach. After a long argument he sums up thus:—"Our conclusion must be this: although there was *estrangement* between the East and West, the Easterns were not *excommunicated* by Rome. Euphemius and S. Macedonius were not anathematized."¹ Now, it is this conclusion which I propose to combat, and I hope to convince any one, who will take the trouble to read this Appendix, that from the year 484, when Felix III. of Rome excommunicated Acacius of Constantinople, until the year 519 the breach between the main body of the Eastern Church and the see of Rome was complete.

It is natural to begin my proof by citing the formal words of Felix III. Immediately after Acacius had been excommunicated on July 28, 484, Felix notified the fact to his Roman flock by posting up a proclamation or "edict," which was thus worded: "Acacius, after having been twice admonished by us, has not ceased to make light of our salutary decrees, and has thought it right to imprison me in the persons of my legates. Him God has cast out from the priestly office by means of a sentence inspired by heaven. Therefore if after the publication of this announcement *any bishop, clerk, monk, or layman shall hold communion with the aforesaid Acacius, let him be anathema*, and may this sentence be carried out by the Holy Ghost."² Thus on the very day on which Acacius was excommunicated, a similar anathema was fulminated against all persons of whatever degree, who should hold communion with him. As a matter of fact, for the next thirty-five years, or thereabouts, the bishops, clergy, and faithful of the orthodox Eastern Church, with very few exceptions,³

¹ *Dublin Review* for April, 1894, vol. cxiv. p. 379.

² *Epistl. RR. Pont. Genuin. et quæ ad eos scriptæ sunt a S. Hilario ad Pelagium ii.*, ed. Thiel, Felicitus III. *Ep.* vii., p. 247.

³ There was a short period during the pontificate of Gelasius, when the bishops of the province of Dardania appear to have been in the Roman communion. But afterwards they broke away from the pope. In the time of Symmachus they were in communion with the East and not with the West. They returned to the Roman communion soon after Hormisdas' accession. In the early part of Hormisdas' episcopate various bishops in Scythia, Illyricum, and Epirus were reconciled with Rome. Some of them soon afterwards undid their previous action and returned to the communion of the East. For a long time after the breach between Rome and Constantinople, some of the Constantinopolitan monks adhered

did hold communion with Acacius, both during his lifetime and after his death in 489, and they were consequently regarded by the Roman Church and by the whole West as cut off from Catholic communion, and as being under the sentence of anathema. The proofs of this last statement are so numerous, that it would be quite impossible to set them forth at length; but it will be well to give a few quotations, which between them will cover the whole period, and which, as far as possible, shall be arranged in chronological order.

In the very next year (A.D. 485) a fresh council was held at Rome in the month of October. Forty-two Italian bishops attended it, and they addressed a synodical letter (*Olim nobis*) to such of the presbyters and archimandrites in Constantinople and Bithynia as sided with Felix and were in opposition to Acacius. At the end of this letter every one of these bishops appended to his signature a formal anathema directed against Peter Mongus of Alexandria, Acacius of Constantinople, Peter the Fuller of Antioch, "and all their followers"¹ (*omnibusque sequacibus eorum*).

In the year 494 Pope Gelasius addressed a letter (*Famuli*) to the Emperor Anastasius. In the course of this letter he says, "I say nothing about the fact that, on account of matters connected with the public games, the authority of your Piety has quite lately curbed the tumults of the mob; and much more will the people of Constantinople obey you with a view to the salvation of their souls, if you Princes bring them back to Catholic and Apostolic communion."² In Gelasius' opinion the members of Euphemius' Constantinopolitan flock were outside the Catholic and Apostolic communion, and they needed to be brought back to it, if their souls were to be saved.³

In another letter (*Quid ergo*), addressed to all the Eastern bishops, Pope Gelasius says, "It is not only Acacius who is held guilty, but also all the Eastern pontiffs, who have equally fallen back into this contamination, and are rightly held bound by a similar condemnation."⁴ This letter was written either during the episcopate of Euphemius or during that of his successor, S. Macedonius.⁵

In the year 512 certain Eastern bishops, clergy, monks, and lay people, who belonged to the Latin-speaking portion of Illyricum Orientale, to the Roman communion. On this last point see note 3 on pp. 389, 390. However, though there were some exceptions, it is true to say that for almost thirty-five years the breach was complete between Rome and the great body of the Eastern Church.

¹ "Petro . . . et Acacio . . . necnon etiam Petro Antiocheno . . . omnibusque sequacibus eorum . . . anathema dicens subscripsi."—*Collect. Avellan. Ep.* lxx. § 14, ed. Günther, p. 161.

² Gelas. *Ep.* xii. *ad Anastasium*, § 10, ap. Thiel, p. 357. The plural, *Principes*, is used, it may be, so as to indicate the Empress Ariadne as well as the Emperor Anastasius. Compare *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxiii. §§ 2, 5, 8, 10 (ed. Günther, pp. 708, 709, 710). Or is it the plural of respect? Perhaps the latter hypothesis is the more probable.

³ In the following year (495) was held the Council at Rome, in the course of which the ex-legate, Misenus, was absolved and restored. On pp. 383, 384 I have given an account of the anathemas which were fulminated at that council against all who communicated with the name and memory of Acacius.

⁴ Gelas. *Ep.* xxvii. § 12, ap. Thiel, p. 435.

⁵ The reader may also be referred to Gelas. *Ep.* xviii. § 2 (ap. Thiel, pp. 383, 384), and to *Ep.* xxvi. § 14 (ap. Thiel, pp. 411, 412).

addressed a letter (*Bonus*) to Pope Symmachus,¹ in the course of which they say, "If one man [Acacius] sinned, why does the wrath of God press *by means of the anathema* on the whole congregation, or rather on the whole habitable world? . . . Why are we regarded by you as heretics, and why are we under anathema, we who lovingly accept that holy letter [the tome of S. Leo] and the things which were said in the holy synod"² [the Chalcedonian definition]? It is clear that even those bishops of the Eastern empire who spoke Latin, and who, properly speaking, belonged to the Roman patriarchate, and who were in their belief thoroughly orthodox, nevertheless were in 512 still under the anathema of Rome, because they retained the name of Acacius on their diptychs, or at any rate remained in communion with churches on whose diptychs that name was retained.

In August, 515, Pope Hormisdas sent certain legates to Constantinople. He gave them written instructions, the *indiculus* beginning with the words *Cum Dei*, together with two appendixes. In the first of these appendixes the pope lays down the terms which are to be exacted from all Eastern bishops who wish to be admitted to the communion of the Roman Church. Amongst other things which are to be required of them, they are publicly to anathematize Acacius and Peter of Antioch together with their allies.³ It is clear that in 515 all those who could be described as "*socii*" of the departed Acacius, that is to say, all those who recited his name at the altar from the diptychs, and all those who communicated with such reciters, all such persons were regarded by Hormisdas as being under anathema.

In February, 518, Hormisdas wrote a letter (*Lectis litteris*) to certain presbyters, deacons, and archimandrites of Syria Secunda.⁴ After referring to Nestorius and Eutyches, who had been condemned by the decrees of councils, the pope goes on to say, "But we equally admonish you to avoid their followers, whom the apostolic see regards as on a par with their teachers (*deprehendit pares auctoribus suis*), and has added to the list of the condemned. Such are Dioscorus, and the parricide, Timothy [the Cat], Peter of Alexandria, Acacius of Constantinople with his followers (*cum sequacibus suis, μετὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ*

¹ Thiel has shown in his *Monitum praeivium in Symmachi epistolam 12 (Epist. RR. PP., p. 97)* that Symmachus' letter *Quod plene* is a reply to the letter *Bonus*. Now, the letter *Quod plene* is addressed "universis episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus, archimandritis, et cuncto ordini vel plebi per Illyricum, Dardaniam, et utramque Daciam." This inscription makes it clear who the writers of the letter *Bonus* were. That letter purports to emanate from the *Ecclesia Orientalis*; but it does not require much knowledge of the state of the Church in the Eastern empire during the latter half of the reign of Anastasius to make it quite certain that, if the inscription of the letter *Bonus* is anything more than a heading composed by a later scribe, the expression *Ecclesia Orientalis* must stand, not for the whole, but only for a part, and that a small part, of the Eastern Church. It may be noted that the letter *Quod plene* is numbered in Thiel's edition as the 13th letter of Symmachus. It appears also as the 104th letter in the *Collectio Avellana*.

² *Ep. inter Symmachianas* xii. §§ 2, 3, ap. Thiel, p. 711.

³ "Acacium . . . sed et Petrum Antiochenum anathematizantes cum sociis eorum."—*Collect. Avellan. Ep. cxvi. a, § 1, p. 520.*

⁴ On the ecclesiastical status of these clerks and monks of Syria Secunda, see pp. 418-420.

ἀκολούθων), Peter also of Antioch,"¹ etc. Here Euphemius and S. Macedonius, who up to the day of their death had communicated with the name and memory of Acacius, and other persons who could be similarly described as "followers" of that patriarch, are all reckoned by Hormisdas as "on a par" with Nestorius and Eutyches.

In January, 519, Hormisdas sent a fresh legation to Constantinople to bring about reunion between the East and the West. The legates carried with them a letter (*Reddidimus*) from the pope to the patriarch, John of Constantinople. In this letter the pope says, "We exhort you therefore, brother, and by the help of the mercy of our God we urge upon you, that, separating yourself from all contamination of the heretics by condemning Acacius *with his followers (cum sequacibus suis)*, you feed along with us in the participation of the Body of the Lord."² There can be no shadow of a doubt that "the followers" of Acacius, whom the patriarch is urged to condemn, were Euphemius, S. Macedonius, and all other bishops who retained the name of Acacius on the diptychs, and all other persons who communicated with such bishops.

Hormisdas gave also to his legates in January, 519, written instructions, the *indiculus* beginning with the words *Cum Deo*, in which occurs a passage of very great importance for our present purpose. After indicating to the legates how they are to begin the conversation, when they are admitted for the first time by the Emperor to an audience, Hormisdas goes on as follows: "But if the Emperor should wish to have it made known to him what it is that you desire the [Constantinopolitan] bishop to do, show to him the formula of the *libellus*, which you are taking with you. But if, after consenting to the anathema on Acacius, he goes on to say that the names of the successors of Acacius ought to be recited [at the reading of the diptychs], because some of them were sent into exile for their defence of the Council of Chalcedon,³ you will inform him that it is not in your power to remove anything from the formula of the *libellus*, in which not only the condemned persons are mentioned, but also in a similar manner their *followers* (in qua *sequaces damnatorum* pariter continentur). But if you are not able to turn them aside from this proposal, at least insist on thus much, namely, that Acacius be anathematized by name in accordance with the *libellus* which we have given to you, and that the names of his successors be removed from the diptychs and so be passed over in silence. When this has been done, receive the Bishop of Constantinople into our communion."⁴

¹ *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxl. § 15, pp. 580, 581.

² *Ibid.* cl. § 6, p. 599.

³ Obviously, allusion is here made to Euphemius and S. Macedonius, who, both of them, went into exile on account of their fidelity to the Council of Chalcedon.

⁴ "Si vero imperator sibi aperiri voluerit, quid sit quod ab episcopo fieri potest, formam libelli, quam portatis, ostendite. Quod si de anathemate Acacii consentiens successores ejus dixerit recitandos ob hoc, quod propter defensionem Chalcedonensis synodi aliqui eorum fuerint exilio deportati, insinua-bitis nihil vos de libelli posse forma decerpere, in qua sequaces damnatorum pariter continentur. Sed si eos ab hac non potueritis intentione deflectere, saltem hoc acquiescite, ut anathematizato specialiter per libellum, quem vobis dedimus, Acacio de successorum ejus nominibus taceatur ab rasis eorum de diptychorum inscriptione vocabulis. Quo facto episcopum Constantinopolitanum in nostram communionem accipite."—*Collect. Avellan. Ep.* clviii. §§ 6-8, p. 606.

When we compare this passage with the various forms or editions of Hormisdas' *libellus* which have come down to our time, it becomes perfectly clear that the copy of the *libellus* which the legates brought with them to Constantinople in 519, pronounced an anathema on various persons mentioned by name, of whom Acacius was one; it seems also clear that the followers of these persons, the *sequaces damnatorum*, were included in the anathema, but they were grouped together under a general formula, and no list of their names appeared in the *libellus*;¹ and finally there can be no doubt that there was a clause in the *libellus* binding those who signed it to remove from the diptychs the names of those who had been anathematized in the earlier part of the document. As the *libellus* was worded, when the legates started from Rome, this last clause would pledge the signatories to remove from the diptychs both the names of the *damnati* and also the names of the *sequaces damnatorum*. But Hormisdas in his *indiculus* gives his legates to understand that, if difficulties should be raised, he is willing that the formula should be so far altered as to drop all mention of the *sequaces* from the clause in which the anathema is pronounced. The legates are, however, in any case to insist on the anathematizing of Acacius by name in accordance with the *libellus*, and on the removal of the names of the *sequaces* from the diptychs.

Any one who will take the trouble to investigate the different forms of the *libellus* which have come down to us, will find that these conclusions are remarkably confirmed by the results of such an investigation. We possess six forms of the *libellus*, of which the originals date from the sixth century. Three of these forms were drawn up in the period anterior to the Holy Week of the year 519, when the reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople took place. One of the forms played a part in that reconciliation. And the two others are of later date. All of these six forms contain an express anathema on Acacius; and according to the four earlier ones the signatories promise to remove from the diptychs the names of those who had been separated from the communion of the Church. But the three earlier forms extend the anathema to the *sequaces* of Acacius, whereas in the three later forms the wording has been altered so as to avoid inflicting that indignity on the see of Constantinople.²

¹ The anathema clause of the original form of the *libellus* will be found below on p. 416.

² The dropping of the mention of the *sequaces* from the anathema-clause would affect the meaning of the later clause which pledged the signatories to remove from the diptychs the names of those who had been separated from the communion of the Church. That later clause would now be naturally understood as applying only to the *damnati*, and as having no reference to the *sequaces damnatorum*. The removal of the names of the *sequaces* from the diptychs had therefore to be secured by a separate article in the concordat. It no longer followed as a necessary result of the acceptance of the *libellus*. For the convenience of the reader, I here append what may be called the diptych-clause of the *libellus*. I take it from the formula signed by John of Constantinople: "Promittens in sequenti tempore sequestratos a communione ecclesiae catholicae, id est *in omnibus* non consentientes sedi apostolicae, eorum nomina inter sacra non recitanda esse mysteria." In the earlier copies of the *libellus*, which belong to the period preceding the reconciliation of the year 519, the italicized words, *in omnibus*, are not found.

The details of proof will be found in the *Addendum* at the end of this Appendix.¹

There can, I think, be no doubt that up to the time when, in January, 519, Hormisdas dispatched his embassy of reconciliation to Constantinople, he had been requiring all bishops, who wished to be received into his communion, to anathematize the successors of Acacius. He of course could not have done this if he had not regarded those successors as under the anathema of Rome. In fact, it cannot be seriously questioned that the anathema, pronounced by Felix III. in July, 484, against all who should communicate with Acacius, was regarded at Rome as having remained in force during the thirty-five years, or thereabouts, which elapsed between July, 484, and March, 519. Practically the whole Eastern Church was considered at Rome as being under anathema.² And all the great saints, who belonged to the Eastern Church at that epoch, knew well that they were living in a state of complete separation from the pope, and in fact under papal excommunication; and many of them died in that same condition. To us that seems a very natural state of things. To Ultramontanes it must, one would suppose, seem astounding. It is for them, if they are not disheartened by Dr. Rivington's failure, to make a fresh effort to disprove the fact. Or else let them frankly admit it together with the consequences which flow from it.

Addendum on Various Forms of Hormisdas' "Libellus" (see above).

Three copies of Hormisdas' *libellus*, belonging to the reign of the Emperor Anastasius, and therefore anterior to the reconciliation of Rome and Constantinople in 519, have come down to us.

¹ See pp. 414-417.

² I hardly think that any confirmation of this conclusion is needed, because the proof which I have given in the text appears to me to be demonstrative. However, no harm will be done if I quote the following passages.

Facundus of Hermiane, in his *Liber contra Mocianum*, written about half a century after the close of the schism, says (*P. L.*, lxxvii. 857), speaking of the Emperor Zeno, "Qui igitur supradictus Zeno, sedis apostolicæ decreta contemnens, prædicto Acacio communicabat, et omnes ecclesias in sui regni finibus constitutas idem facere compellebat, Anastasio deinde in imperium et in præsumptionem similem succedente, omnis Oriens, præter admodum paucos qui in illa multitudine occulti latebant, a communionem sedis apostolicæ remotus per 40 ferme annos usque ad tempora Justini permansit." The reader will note Facundus' tone, when speaking of the Roman see, and will also remember that Facundus is a Latin of the second half of the sixth century.

In the life of Hormisdas, which is to be found in the Felician epitome of the earliest form of the *Liber Pontificalis*, occurs the following passage: "Hujus [*sc.* Hormisdæ] episcopatu auctoritatem ex constituto synodi misit in Graeciam secundum humanitatem sedis apostolicæ et reconciliavit Graecos qui obligati erant sub anathemate propter Petrum Alexandrinum et Acacium Constantinopolitanum." This passage, in the ungrammatical and corrupt condition in which it appears in the manuscripts, will be found in Duchesne's edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*, pp. 98, 100. On p. 272 of that work Duchesne has conformed the passage to the rules of syntax and orthography, and my quotation is taken from his restoration. Duchesne considers that the life of Hormisdas, which I have quoted above, is the work of a contemporary writer. Mommsen assigns to it a date one hundred years later, but admits its accuracy, and holds that the author derived his facts from documents belonging to the age of Hormisdas. Compare Duchesne's edition of the *Liber Pontif.*, *Prolegom.*, pp. xliii.-xlvi., and Mommsen's edition of the same work, *Prolegom.*, pp. xvii., xviii.

(1) There is first the copy preserved in the *Codex Viridunensis*, now in the royal library at Berlin (*Cod. Berolin. lat.* 79). This copy has been printed by Günther in the fourth appendix to his edition of the *Collectio Avellana* (pp. 800, 801). It concludes as follows: "I have made this my profession, and have subscribed it with my own hand, and have offered it to thee, Hormisdas, the holy and venerable pope of the city of Rome, by the instrumentality of the most glorious man, Vitalian, the Magister [militum]." One may feel practically certain that this form of the *libellus* was signed by the bishops of Dardania, Illyricum, and Scythia, most of whom petitioned to be admitted to the communion of Hormisdas in the earlier part of the year 515.¹ Vitalian held the office of *Magister militum* of Thrace from the latter part of 514 to the latter part of 515. He posed as the champion of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, and was in close communication with the bishops of Illyricum and Scythia, who were breaking away from the communion of the Eastern Church; and he sent an embassy to Hormisdas, which must have arrived in Rome before August 11, 515.² The signed copies of the *libellus* were no doubt brought to Rome by this embassy.³

(2) The second copy of the *libellus* which has come down to us has been preserved in the *Collectio Avellana*,⁴ and was sent by Hormisdas to Constantinople in August, 515. It forms the second appendix to the Instructions (*indculus*) given by the pope to the legates, whom he was sending to the Emperor Anastasius.⁵

(3) The third copy of the *libellus* was sent by Hormisdas to the bishops of Spain along with the covering letter, *Inter ea quae notitiae*, to which the date April 2, 517, must undoubtedly be assigned.⁶ The heading, prefixed to this copy of the *libellus*, informs us that it had been transcribed from the original in the *scrinium* of the Roman Church by Boniface, the notary. The text of this copy is preserved for us in the *Hispana*,⁷ and also in a manuscript at Paris (*Cod. Paris. Suppl. lat.* 205).

¹ Cf. Hormisd. *Ep.* ix. ad *S. Caesarium Arclat.*, ap. Thiel, p. 759.

² Cf. *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxvi. § 7, p. 514.

³ There must have been some earlier communications with Rome, when the movement among the Illyrian and Scythian bishops began, in the year 514. The *libellus* was obviously drafted in Rome, and not in Illyricum. In fact, the heading of the copy in the *Codex Viridunensis* runs thus: "Incipit libellus professionis fidei quem constituit Papa Hormisda sedis apostolicae dari a singulis episcopis Graeciarum."

⁴ The so-called *Collectio Avellana* contains a mass of important documents belonging to the period which intervened between the years 367 and 553. These documents are of varied *provenance*. Some emanate from Roman or Byzantine Emperors or magistrates. Others, and those the large majority, emanate from bishops, priests, or synods. The collection was compiled at Rome during the latter half of the sixth century. It contains 244 documents, of which more than 200 have been preserved for us by this collection only.

⁵ Cf. *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxvi. b, pp. 520-522.

⁶ The letter *Inter ea quae notitiae* (Hormisd. *Ep.* xxvi., ap. Thiel, pp. 793-796) was evidently sent from Rome to Spain by the messenger, who also took with him the letter *Felix dilectio* (Hormisd. *Ep.* xxiv., ap. Thiel, pp. 787, 788), addressed to John of Elche. That letter is dated April 2, 517.

⁷ The *Collectio Hispana* is a collection of conciliar acts and canons, and of papal letters, which was compiled in Spain. The Ballerini hold (*De Antiq. Collection. et Collector. Canonum*, pars iii. cap. iv. § 3, n. 7, *P. L.*, lvi. 227) that the date of compilation lies between the years 633 and 636.

That portion of the *libellus* which contains the anathemas on the Monophysites and on those who were in varying degrees tainted with their "contagion" (to use Hormisdas' expression), is subjoined. The text is taken from Boniface's copy preserved in the *Hispana*. The more important variants of the *Codex Viridunensis* (V) and of the *Collectio Avellana* (A) are given in the notes.

"*Similiter et*¹ *anathematizantes et Eutychem et Dioscorum Alexandrinum, in sancta synodo, quam sequimur et amplectimur, Chalcedonensi damnatos, quae secuta sanctum concilium Nicaenum fidem apostolicam praedicavit,*² *detestamur et Timotheum*³ *parricidam, Aelurum cognomento, discipulum quoque ipsius et*⁴ *sequacem in omnibus Petrum Alexandrinum. Condemnamus etiam et anathematizamus Acacium Constantinopolitanum quondam episcopum ab apostolica sede damnatum, eorum*⁵ *complicem et sequacem,*⁶ *vel qui in eorum communionis societate permanserint:*⁷ *quia Acacius*⁸ *quorum se communioni*⁹ *miscuit, ipsorum similem*¹⁰ *jure*¹¹ *meruit in damnatione sententiam. Petrum nihilominus Antiochenum damnamus*¹² *cum sequacibus suis et omnium suprascriptorum."*

It will be observed that these three copies of the *libellus* agree in this that they place together under one condemnation Peter the Fuller of Antioch and the *sequaces omnium suprascriptorum*. This last category is equivalent to the *sequaces damnatorum* mentioned by Hormisdas in his *indiculum* (*Cum Deo*¹³), and it obviously includes the *sequaces* of Acacius. Now, there can be no question that Peter the Fuller, who was one of the worst of the Monophysites, was under the anathema of Rome. The council of Rome in October, 485, had pronounced an anathema upon him.¹⁴ Similarly, at the Council of Rome held on May 13, 495, Pope Gelasius had absolved and restored Misenus partly on the ground that he had anathematized Peter the Fuller and a number of other heretics.¹⁵ And again in 515 Hormisdas had required every Eastern bishop who wished to be admitted to his communion, to anathematize publicly that same Peter.¹⁶ There can be no question, therefore, that all these three copies of the *libellus* agree in fulminating an anathema against the *sequaces* of Acacius; that is to say, against Euphemius, S. Macedonius and others like them.

When we pass from the copies of the *libellus*, which are anterior to the reconciliation of Rome and Constantinople in 519, and proceed to investigate the copy which played a part in that reconciliation, and others of later date, we find a very marked change in the clause which deals with the *sequaces*.

¹ VA read *una cum isto*.

² VA omit the clause *quae secuta . . . praedicavit*.

³ VA read *his Timotheum adicientes*.

⁴ VA read *atque*.

⁵ V omits (no doubt through the carelessness of the scribe) "*quondam episcopum ab apostolica sede damnatum, eorum*."

⁶ A, confusing the first *sequacem* with the second *sequacem*, omits through homoeoteleuton, *in omnibus Petrum . . . sequacem*.

⁷ V reads *persistunt*.

⁸ VA omit *Acacius*.

⁹ V inserts *quis* after *communioni*.

¹⁰ V omits *similem*.

¹¹ VA omit *jure*.

¹² VA read *damnantes*.

¹³ See p. 412.

¹⁴ See p. 410.

¹⁵ See p. 384.

¹⁶ See p. 411.

The letter (*Redditis*) which John, the Patriarch of Constantinople, addressed to Hormisdas, and in which he incorporated a Greek version of the *libellus*, has come down to us, in what was no doubt the official Latin translation, through two independent channels.¹ It forms part of the *Collectio Avellana*,² and it is also included in the *Hispana*, Hormisdas having sent a copy of the translation to the Spanish bishop, John of Elche, within a few weeks of the arrival of the letter in Rome.³ The Latin version of the letter, as it has come down to us in the *Hispana*, may be seen in the *Epistolae Decretales ac Rescripta RR. PP.*⁴ edited by F. A. Gonzalez, or in Migne's reprint.⁵ Now, the critical sentence, in which, as we read it in the earlier forms of the *libellus*, the *sequaces suprascriptorum* are condemned, appears in an altered form in the Patriarch John's letter to Hormisdas. The sentence now reads as follows: "Simili modo et Petrum Antiochenum condemnantes anathematizamus cum sequacibus suis et omnibus suprascriptis." By the ingenious change of "*omnium suprascriptorum*" into "*omnibus suprascriptis*," while the anathema is still directed against the *sequaces* of Peter the Fuller, the *sequaces* of the other *dammati* are, so far as this sentence is concerned, exempted from censure; and, when the whole *libellus* is read through, it becomes perfectly evident that the *sequaces* of Acacius are left by it unanathematized.⁶ It is clear that, in accordance with the permission given to them by Hormisdas,⁷ the legates allowed John, the Patriarch, to sign a mitigated form of the *libellus*; and we may be morally certain that throughout the East it was a mitigated form of this sort that was henceforth used. This conclusion is confirmed by the two later forms of the *libellus*, belonging to the sixth century, which have come down to us.

The first of these is the copy of the *libellus* given by the Emperor Justinian to Pope Agapetus on the occasion of that pontiff's visit to Constantinople. The copy is dated March 16, 536.

The other is the almost exactly similar copy given to Agapetus on the same occasion by Mennas, the Patriarch-elect of the imperial city.

Both of these documents are preserved in the *Collectio Avellana*.⁸ In both we find in the critical sentence the words *omnibus suprascriptis*, and not the words *omnium suprascriptorum*.

¹ On the independence of the *Avellana* and the *Hispana* as channels through which the letter *Redditis* has come down to us, see Günther's *Prolegomena* to his edition of the *Avellana*, cap. iii., pp. lxxviii.-lxxx.

² Cf. *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* clix., pp. 607-610.

³ Cf. Hormisd. *Ep.* lxxxviii. *ad Joann. Illicit.*, ap. Thiel, p. 885.

⁴ Tom. ii. p. 144.

⁵ *P. L.*, lxxxiv. 817, 818.

⁶ Hefele has failed to notice the change which was made in the *libellus*. He considers (vol. iv. pp. 122, 123, E. tr.) that the Patriarch John "pronounced anathema . . . over Acacius and his followers." To me it seems quite clear that Hefele has made a mistake. Possibly, he may have supposed that an earlier clause in the *libellus* contains an anathema on the followers of Acacius. That clause runs as follows: "anathematizamus similiter Acacium . . . complicem eorum et sequacem factum nec non et perseverantes eorum communioni et participationi." But the second *eorum* in this clause must refer to the same persons as the first *eorum*. And as the first *eorum* cannot include Acacius, neither does the second. On this point I have the pleasure of agreeing with Dr. Rivington (see the *Dublin Review* for April, 1894, vol. cxiv. p. 374).

⁷ Compare pp. 412, 413.

⁸ *Epp.* lxxxix. and xc., pp. 338-342.

APPENDIX K.

The 350 Martyrs of Syria Secunda (see p. 392).

I PROPOSE to show in this Appendix that the 350 martyrs of Syria Secunda, who are commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on July 31, were not in the Roman communion when they died.

As has been stated in the twelfth lecture, these martyrs were orthodox monks, who were going on pilgrimage to the sanctuary of S. Symeon Stylites, the wonderful ruins of which still remain at Kuláat es-Simân.¹ While they were on the road they were attacked and murdered by a band of assassins hired by Severus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, and Peter, the Monophysite Metropolitan of Apamea. From the fact that the Roman Church venerates them as martyrs, and from the letter of their friends to Pope Hormisdas,² it is clear that they were murdered on account of their fidelity to the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. The date of the martyrdom seems to be A.D. 517, or possibly A.D. 516.

Baronius says that these monks were "Ecclesiae Romanae communicantes," and that, having previously been polluted with "the stain of the heretics," they had "joined themselves to the apostolic see."³ When he says that they had been previously polluted with "the stain of the heretics," what he means is that they belonged to the orthodox Church of the East, which had been out of communion with Rome for thirty-two or thirty-three years, and which still kept the name of Acacius on its diptychs. But in that Church they had had for their patriarch at Antioch S. Flavian II., and they had enjoyed the communion of S. Macedonius of Constantinople and of S. Elias of Jerusalem, as well as of all that great galaxy of saints which adorned the Eastern Church during that period of its isolation. When Baronius says that before their death they had "joined themselves to the apostolic see," he makes a gratuitous statement, which he does not attempt to prove. After their martyrdom some of their friends, who like themselves were archimandrites and monks of Syria Secunda, wrote a letter⁴ (*Gratia salvatoris*) to Hormisdas, imploring him to do what he could to succour them in their misery. In the course of this letter they give an account of the martyrdom of the 350. If this letter is studied, it will be seen at once that the writers were not, when they wrote, in communion with Hormisdas. They wished to be admitted into his communion and thus secure the help of his powerful protection. It will also be seen that they certainly had been in communion with the 350 martyrs. Many of them had been companions of the martyrs in the pilgrimage, in the course of which the attack was made

¹ For a description of these ruins, see Mr. George Williams' *Introduction* to Dr. Neale's *History of the Patriarchate of Antioch*, pp. xlix.-lv.

² Coleti, v. 598.

³ *Annal. Eccl.*, s.a. 517, tom. vi. p. 694, edit. 1658.

⁴ Coleti, v. 598-602, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxxxix., pp. 565-571, ed. Günther.

by the Monophysite assassins. The martyrs were therefore also external to the Roman communion. There were indeed some persons in Syria Secunda who in the course of the two previous years, 515 and 516, had signed Hormisdas' *libellus* and had been received into the communion of the pope. We learn this fact from Hormisdas' letter (*Inter ea quae notitiae*), addressed to the bishops of Spain, a letter which was dispatched from Rome in April, 517.¹ But the martyred monks were evidently not among the number of those who signed. They had stood firm in their adhesion to the orthodox Eastern Church. It follows that these martyrs, when they won their crown, were, if we are to accept the theories of Baronius, suffering pollution from "the stain of the heretics." It will, I think, throw light on the whole matter, and will illustrate the way in which the Eastern Church looked on the question of communion with the see of Rome, if I give an account of the communications which passed between the Syrian monks who survived and the pope.

After the massacre of the 350, the surviving archimandrites and monks sent two of their brethren, John and Sergius, to Constantinople, to claim justice and protection from the Emperor. But Anastasius would not hear their petition, and drove them out of the city.² When the news of this proceeding reached Syria, the poor monks, who were being persecuted by the heretical patriarch and metropolitan, and who could get no redress from the civil power, determined to write to Hormisdas in distant Rome. There was no influential person in the East to whom they could write. The Emperor had driven into exile all the orthodox patriarchs, and had intruded heretics into their sees. Hormisdas alone was living in security under the protection of the Arian king of the Goths, Theodoric. We have only a Latin translation of the letter to Hormisdas. In the salutation they style the pope "universae orbis terrae patriarchae," which obviously represents *οικουμενικῆ πατριάρχῃ* (ecumenical patriarch), and they speak of him as "occupying the see of Peter, the chief of the apostles." In the course of their letter they petition (*deprecamur*) the pope "to arise with fervour and zeal, and to feel a righteous grief for the torn body ('for,' they say, 'thou art the head of all'), and to vindicate the faith which has been despised, and the canons which have been trampled upon, and the Fathers who have been blasphemed, and so great a synod³ which has been anathematized. To you has been given by God power and authority to bind and to loose. . . . Arise, holy Fathers,⁴ come and rescue us; be imitators of our Lord, Who came from heaven to earth to seek the wandering sheep; remember Peter the chief of the apostles, whose see you adorn, and Paul the chosen vessel, who, journeying about, gave light to the world," etc. Further on they say, "In this our petition (*deprecatione*), which stands in lieu of a profession of faith (*libelli*), we anathematize all those who have been cast out and excommunicated by your apostolic see." Then they mention specially Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Peter Mongus, and Peter the Fuller; and finally they say, "Moreover [we

¹ See p. 415, note 6.

² Coleti, v. 599, and Günther (*Op. cit.*, p. 567).

³ The Synod of Chalcedon.

⁴ Addressing, as it would seem, all the bishops of the West; or perhaps the expression, "patres sancti," is the plural of respect (compare p. 410, note 2).

anathematize] Acacius, who was Bishop of Constantinople, and who communicated with them, and all who defend any one of those heretics."¹

It should be noticed that the Syrian monks are evidently approaching the Roman see for the first time. They say that their petition is to stand in lieu of a "*libellus*." They knew that Rome would do nothing for them, unless they explicitly anathematized Acacius and his followers. Still they express no sorrow for having been for more than thirty years out of communion with Rome. They write as those who wished to be admitted into communion with the West, not as those who asked to be received for the first time into fellowship with the Catholic Church.

In February, 518, Hormisdas sent a reply (*Lectis litteris*) to this letter. The pope takes a hopeful view of his correspondents' ecclesiastical position. After giving them some good advice, as to how to behave in times of persecution, he says, "We willingly communicate with you in these teachings. For the wise Solomon saith, 'Well is he that speaketh in the ears of them that will hear :'² for it is indeed a joy to hold converse with willing people, and to urge into the right way those who are not antagonistic. *For we hold a pledge of your faith, the earnestness professed by your letter, by which, having been separated from the defilement of transgressors, you are returning to the teachings and commandments of the apostolic see, entering indeed late in the day into the way of truth.*"³ Afterwards he goes on to urge them to complete the work of separating themselves from the mud in which the heretics are swallowed up. The pope's letter is addressed to "the priests, deacons, and archimandrites of Syria Secunda, and to other orthodox persons living in any region of the East, and abiding in the communion of the apostolic see."⁴ It was through the instrumentality of their letter and of this reply to it, that the Syrian monks were brought into communion with the pope.

But it would be a great mistake to suppose that these Eastern religious, by writing their respectful and complimentary letter to the pope, meant to submit to Rome on any such theory as that only in the Roman communion is the true Church of God to be found. As I have observed before, such a notion never entered the minds of Eastern Catholics. In their dire distress, when their lives were in danger, and all the orthodox patriarchs of the East were in banishment, they had been willing to anathematize Acacius and his followers, in the hope of getting some sympathy and help from the pope. But five months after the pope's reply had been dispatched, we find these same Syrian monks in full communion with the new Patriarch of Constantinople, John the Cappadocian, although he was out of communion with the pope, and was still retaining the name of Acacius on his diptychs. The fact was that Anastasius was dead, and Justin had come to the throne, and the Eastern Church was arising out of the dust. In the summer of the year 518, the archimandrites and monks of Syria

¹ *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxxxix. § 10, ed. Günther, p. 568, et Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum Genuinae*, Hormisd. *Ep.* xxxix. § 5, p. 817. "Nihilominus et Acacium, qui fuit Constantinopolitanus episcopus, eorum communicatorem et omnes qui unum illorum haereticorum defendunt."

² *Ecclus.* xxv. 9.

³ Coleti, v. 1116, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxl. § 8, p. 576.

⁴ *Ibid.*, v. 1112, and *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxl. § 1, *interpr. Graec.*, p. 573.

Secunda¹ presented a written memorial to the orthodox bishops of their province, in which they gave a detailed account of the crimes of Severus of Antioch and of Peter of Apamea. In this memorial they describe again the massacre of the 350 martyrs. The list of names appended to this memorial is substantially the same, so far as it goes, as the list appended to the letter to Hormisdas.² The bishops of the province, having received this memorial and other evidence on the subject of the Metropolitan Peter's misdeeds, sent the whole mass of documents,³ with a letter of their own, to the Patriarch John of Constantinople, and to his "resident synod."⁴ They address John in very respectful terms, calling him "Father of fathers,⁵ archbishop, and ecumenical patriarch." In the course of their letter the bishops go on to say that "we, instructed by the holy determination of your teachings, anathematize Severus and Peter, the madmen;" and they add, "we, following your example, most blessed ones, deprive them of all honour, dignity, and episcopal power."⁶ Then they ask John to confirm (ἐπικυρῶσαι) their acts, and to inform the Emperor of them. It is to be observed that these bishops of Syria Secunda were not headed by their metropolitan; they were proceeding against him. They were all suffragan bishops of the province, and they were deposing and excommunicating their intruded patriarch and their intruded metropolitan; so they might well ask the Patriarch of Constantinople to confirm what they had done. Anyhow, they were in full communion with John, and therefore out of communion with Rome; and it is plain that the archimandrites and monks who were transmitting their memorial to the Constantinopolitan patriarch by the hands of their bishops, had naturally, in the altered state of things, passed back into the communion of the Eastern Church. The real reunion of the patriarchate of Antioch with Rome did not take place until A.D. 521,⁷ four years after the martyrdom of the 350.

APPENDIX L.

On the fact that many of the oriental bishops were admitted to the communion of Hormisdas without signing his "libellus" (see p. 402).

It is in no way necessary to the success of my general argument that I should show that a considerable portion of the Eastern episcopate escaped the disagreeable necessity of signing Hormisdas' *libellus*. Even

¹ Coleti, v. 1217-1225.

² In the 5th volume of Coleti compare coll. 599 ff. with coll. 1224, 1225.

³ Coleti, v. 1184-1188.

⁴ *σύννοδος ἐνδημοῦσα.*

⁵ Mr. Allnatt (*Cathedra Petri*, 2nd edit., 106, 107) makes a great point of this title having been "given to the pope by the Orientals, from the sixth century downwards." But this sort of argument loses all its force when one discovers that titles of similar magnificence were also given to the other patriarchs. If I may venture to say so, Mr. Allnatt is very painstaking, but he appears to me to be curiously indiscriminating.

⁶ Coleti, v. 1188.

⁷ See Hormisdas' letter to the Patriarch Epiphanius of Constantinople, dated March 26, 521 (*Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxvii. § 6, pp. 726, 728), and compare an earlier letter of Epiphanius to Hormisdas (*Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxiii. §§ 5, 6, p. 708).

if they did sign it, they signed it under compulsion from the Emperor, under threats of fire and sword, and their action was entirely valueless as a testimony to the faith of the Eastern Church, whose whole history is one long contradiction to the principles laid down in the *libellus*. But from the point of view of history the question whether they did or did not sign that document possesses considerable interest. To me it seems in the highest degree probable that they were not compelled to sign the *libellus* of Hormisdas. I have already pointed out¹ that Hormisdas begged the Patriarch Epiphanius to send him a list of those whom he received into his communion, and to subjoin the contents of the *libelli*, which those bishops would present on the occasion of their reception. Commenting on this fact, the very learned historian Pagi, of the order of the Conventual Minorites, observes, "We come to this conclusion, namely that Hormisdas, who at first wished to compel the Eastern bishops to subscribe the formulary put forth by himself and offered to them by his legates, at last yielded to their opposition. For, if he had insisted on their subscribing that formulary, there would have been no need for Epiphanius to report to him what the *libelli*, or professions of faith, set forth by the aforesaid bishops contained, and with what form of words they subscribed."² Natalis Alexander argues in a similar way.³ And the argument of these two great Roman Catholic critics seems to me to be very convincing.

Moreover, we have positive proof that Hormisdas did not in all cases insist on his *libellus* being signed. For example, he did not insist on its being signed in the case of the archimandrites and monks of Syria Secunda, who in 517 addressed to him the petition *Gratia salvatoris*. As has been pointed out already,⁴ we learn from Hormisdas' letter, *Inter ea, quae notitiae*, that some copies of the earlier and sterner form of the *libellus* had been sent to the province of Syria Secunda in 515 or 516, and had been signed there by some persons.⁵ But the archimandrites and monks who in 517 drew up the petition, *Gratia salvatoris*, while they incorporated into it the anathema clause of the *libellus* in its sternest form, omitted those portions of that document which set forth in strong terms the prerogatives claimed by the Roman see. They describe their petition as "having the force of a *libellus*" (*nostra deprecatione virtutum habente et libelli* ⁶), and the result of their action was that Hormisdas admitted them to his communion. He wrote a reply (*Lectis litteris*) to the Syrian petitioners, and in the full text of the inscription to that reply, as given in the Greek version which was read in the presence of the papal legates

¹ See p. 401.

² Pagi, *Critica*, edit. 1727, ii. 515.

³ Cf. Natal. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.*, saec. v., *Dissert. xx. de causa Euphemii et Macedonii*, ed. Bing, ad Rhen., tom. ix. pp. 623, 624.

⁴ See p. 419.

⁵ Cf. Hormisd. *Ep.* xxvi. *ad omnes episcopos Hispaniae*, § 3, ap. Thiel, p. 794. It would be interesting to discover how it came to pass that the *libellus* was signed at such an early date by persons residing in the province of Syria Secunda. Unless I am mistaken, Syria Secunda was the only province outside of Europe to which the *libellus* penetrated before the reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople in 519.

⁶ *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxxxix. § 10, p. 568.

at the Council of Constantinople in 536, he implies that the petitioners, who certainly were not in the Roman communion when they wrote their petition, are now "abiding in the communion of the apostolic see."¹ These events occurred before the reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople, which took place in 519.

Similarly, in the year 521, after that reconciliation had taken place, it can be shown that Hormisdas was ready to receive into his communion certain persons at Jerusalem on the basis of a profession of faith composed by themselves, a profession which Hormisdas had not yet seen. All that he required was, that on investigation it should turn out that this profession was orthodox on the subjects of the Incarnation and of the Trinity.² We may be perfectly certain that a formulary drafted at Jerusalem did not contain any such statement of the Roman claims as is to be found in the *libellus* of Hormisdas. No Eastern of the first six centuries, very few Easterns of any century, would dream of inserting such a statement into a document drawn up by themselves, or of committing themselves to it in any way, unless they were acting under compulsion; and there seems to be no reason for supposing that these people at Jerusalem were acting under compulsion. They may very possibly have been among the signatories of the *Preces*, addressed to the Emperor Justin in 519 or 520, which begin with the words *Haurite aquam*, and which express a great desire for reunion, but contain nothing resembling the more papalist clauses of Hormisdas' *libellus*.³

It is evident, from what has been said, that Hormisdas was ready both before and after the reconciliation of 519 to waive in the interests of reunion the requirement that his *libellus* should be signed. He required that some document should be signed, and insisted that certain points should be safeguarded in it, but his irreducible *minimum* did not include the papalist clauses of his own *libellus*.

Quite independent of the question of the signature of the *libellus* was the question of expunging from the diptychs the names of the orthodox Eastern bishops who had continued up to the time of their death in communion with the name and memory of Acacius.⁴ It is admitted by Natalis Alexander and by Pagi, and it is not denied by Dr. Rivington, that in a large portion of the Eastern empire the names of these bishops were retained without any break on the diptychs of the churches. Now, I have shown that all these bishops died under the anathema of Rome.⁵ Hormisdas tried hard at first to insist on an acceptance of this anathema

¹ *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* cxl. § 1, p. 573. The full forms of the inscriptions are found sometimes in the Latin, sometimes in the Greek, sometimes in both, sometimes in neither. They were often curtailed by the scribes.

² Cf. *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxvii. §§ 8, 9, 10, 11, pp. 728, 730.

³ Cf. *Collect. Avellan. Ep.* ccxxxii. a, pp. 703-707. The inscription shows that these *preces* were signed at Jerusalem as well as at Antioch and in some other parts of Syria. But the reader must be cautioned against identifying this document with the confession of faith mentioned by Hormisdas in his letter to Epiphanius of March 26, 521. The pope had received from the Emperor a copy of the *preces* in November, 520; but in March, 521, he was still without a copy of the confession of faith.

⁴ On the independence of these two questions, see p. 413, note 2.

⁵ See p. 414.

by all Eastern bishops who applied to be admitted to his communion. In 519 he had to give up the attempt, and to be content with the expunging of their names from the diptychs.¹ Finally, he had to give way again and to admit to his communion large numbers of bishops who retained on their diptychs the names of these excommunicated persons.² The fact that such a considerable number of Eastern churches insisted on continuing to communicate with the names and memories of so many bishops, who had remained to the end of their lives under the anathema of Rome, is another proof of the falsity of the notion that in ancient times Catholics believed that communion with the Church is dependent on communion with the pope.

APPENDIX M.

On the Principle of Development (see p. 406).

WHEN the question is raised, whether the principle of development has a legitimate sphere of action in connexion with the Christian religion, it appears to me to be very necessary that certain distinctions should be kept in mind. For example, one ought to consider separately whether development can be rightly applied to (1) discipline, and again to (2) theological science, and finally to (3) obligatory dogma.

Among the rules of discipline, which are enforced by the Church, there are some which rest immediately on the foundation of divine revelation, and which consequently can neither be abrogated nor changed. But outside of this somewhat restricted sphere rules of discipline are the creation of the Church, and she is free to develop them according to the exigencies of time and place, either in the direction of simplicity or of complexity, of rigour or of relaxation, of centralized authority or of local self-government. And even as regards divinely revealed discipline, the Church is empowered to vary within wide limits its mode of application.

¹ See p. 413.

² No doubt, when we take a large view of the pontificate of Hormisdas, we must admit that with the aid of the civil power the Roman Church won a great victory under his guidance. But the triumph was not unalloyed. And the hard necessity of allowing so many Eastern bishops to retain on the diptychs the names of so many persons, who had braved to the end the anathemas of Rome, must have been very mortifying to the pope. But it was not so mortifying as it would have been, if Dr. Rivington had been correct in his theory that "the insertion of a bishop's name in the sacred diptychs was a sort of canonization and involved the invocation of his intercession" (see *Dublin Review*, vol. cxiv. p. 374). I cannot afford space for a refutation of this theory, which is absolutely inconsistent with the witness of the Fathers and of the old Church historians. It will be sufficient to refer the reader to the disquisitions of two learned Ultramontanes, namely to the Capuchin, Hieremias a Bennetis (*Privilegia Rom. Pont. vindic.*, pars ii. art. x. § ii., edit. 1758, tom. iv. pp. 592, 593), and to Christianus Lupus (*Synodorum Generalium ac Provincialium Læcra, Dissert. de Quinta Synodo*, cap. viii., ed. 1673, pars i. pp. 751, 752).

Again, theological science, though from the very law of its being it is bound to be conservative, is nevertheless continually making progress. Mistakes are pruned away, and accurate knowledge takes the place of uncertain guesses. For, as Dr. Hogan, the President of S. John's Roman Catholic Seminary at Brighton, in Massachusetts, truly observes, "Theology comprises a great variety of elements of very unequal value—dogmas of faith, current doctrines, opinions freely debated, theories, inferences, conjectures, proofs of all degrees of cogency, from scientific demonstration down to intimations of the feeblest kind."¹ Speaking of Roman Catholic theology, as it stood three hundred years ago, the same writer says, "To those unacquainted with their methods, one of the most surprising things in the theologians of that and the preceding ages is the extraordinary amount of knowledge they claimed to have upon all sorts of subjects appertaining to, or touching upon, religion. They knew, for instance, everything about the angelic world. Whole folios were filled with accounts of the origin of the celestial spirits, their probation, organization, action, powers, functions, relations between themselves, with mankind, and with all creation. Theologians told the story of creation itself in its principal stages and in all its particulars with a detail such as nobody would venture upon at the present day. They described the state of innocence as if they themselves had lived through it, explaining what Adam knew and what he was ignorant of, how long he lived in paradise, and what sort of existence he would have led if he had never fallen. . . . With the same imperturbable confidence, they looked out on the world of nature and on the world of grace, solving to their satisfaction the endless problems of each. They seemed to know the purposes of God in all His works, and the necessary laws and limitations of His divine action. They saw into heaven, and told of what sort was the life of the glorified saints. They described in terrible detail the sufferings of the reprobate, located hell, and calculated mathematically its form and dimensions."² One can easily understand that the wiser theologians of the Roman communion have felt that in the presence of such wild luxuriance their theology needed to be developed by the use of the pruning-knife, and this process of pruning has been freely carried out by them during the last three hundred years, though much still remains to be done.

On the other hand, theological science may healthily develop *by*

¹ *Clerical Studies*, p. 166. This book was published in 1898 with the *imprimatur* of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 171, 172. Dr. Hogan gives references in a note to the treatises of Suarez, the Salmanticenses, etc., *De creatione, De angelis, De novissimis*, and to Lessius, *De perfectionibus et moribus divinis*. The Abbé Turmel, in a note to an article on the History of Angelology (*Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature*, tome iv. p. 554), gives an account of Lessius' teaching in his treatise, *De perfectionibus et moribus divinis* (XIII. xxiv. 150 et seqq.). The Abbé says, "Ce qui le préoccupe avant tout, c'est de prouver que la cavité de l'enfer, située au centre de la terre, a seulement une lieue de diamètre et non cent lieues comme le voulait Ribera. Il prouve qu'une lieue suffira largement à trente milliards de damnés attendu que (n. 151) 'valde credibile est eos non ita disponendos per illa loca ut possint pedibus insistere et huc illucque discurrere, sed colligendos in cumulum . . . (n. 161) sicut cum magna copia pisciculorum vel fabarum in ardenti oleo frigitur.'"

growth in many different ways. Bishop Butler, in a well-known passage, has pointed out one very important instrument of such constructive theological development. He says, "As it is owned the whole scheme of scripture is not yet understood; so, if it ever comes to be understood, before the restitution of all things, and without miraculous interpositions; it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at: by the continuance and progress of learning and of liberty; and by particular persons attending to, comparing and pursuing, intimations scattered up and down it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world. For this is the way in which all improvements are made; by thoughtful men's tracing on obscure hints, as it were dropped us by nature accidentally, or which seem to come into our minds by chance. Nor is it at all incredible that a book, which has been so long in the possession of mankind, should contain many truths as yet undiscovered. For all the same phenomena, and the same faculties of investigation, from which such great discoveries in natural knowledge have been made in the present and last age, were equally in the possession of mankind several thousand years before. And possibly it might be intended that events, as they come to pass, should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of scripture."¹

From the preceding observations it will, I hope, have been made clear that the principle of development has a wide field for exercise in the domain of discipline and in the domain of theology. But the question of chief interest for us in relation to the present inquiry is, What scope is there for the principle of development in the domain of obligatory dogma?

No Catholic will deny that the Church has the right to impose on her children from time to time new words and formulas, for the purpose of protecting the faith, which she has received by tradition from our Lord and His apostles, against the misinterpretations of heretics. When Arius, professing to accept the traditional teaching of the Church that the Lord Jesus is God, proceeded to refine on the word "God," and to teach that there was a time when our Lord's higher nature was not, the Church was within her rights when in opposition to this heresy she required her children to confess that our Lord as God is *consubstantial* with the Father. In the Nicene definition there was no development of the substance of the apostolic faith, though there was a development in regard to its expression. An unambiguous formula expressing the old faith was made obligatory, which had not been obligatory before.

Again, the Church having taught from the beginning that the one Lord Christ is at the same time truly God and truly man, it was competent for her to define against the Monophysites that the one divine Person of Christ exists *in two natures*, the divine nature and the human nature. And again, it was competent for her to assert against the Monothelites her immemorial belief that each of those two natures is a complete nature having its own will, and that our incarnate Lord had therefore *two wills*—an uncreated will belonging to His divine nature, and a created will belonging to His human nature. Such an assertion adds nothing to

¹ Butler's *Analogy*, II. iii. 21, ed. Gladstone, 1897, pp. 193, 194.

the substance of the traditional faith of the Church, it merely guards that traditional faith from perverse misinterpretation.

The Church, then, has on various occasions, by her legislative action, authorized and made obligatory the use of new and more developed formulas, with the object of providing effective tests which should unmask the misbelief of innovating heretics. But in connexion with such legislative action, the Church has been wont to protest, by the pens and lips of her representative men, that the adoption of these new formulas implied no change in the substance of her belief. Thus S. Athanasius, writing in the autumn of the year 359 about the action of the Nicene Council, and contrasting it with the action of the Arianizers, who on May 22, 359, had published at Sirmium their "Dated Creed," says, "Without prefixing consulate, month, and day, they [the Nicene Fathers] wrote concerning Easter, 'It seemed good as follows,' for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance; but about the faith they wrote not, 'It seemed good,' but, 'Thus believes the Catholic Church;' and thereupon they confessed how they believed, in order to show that their own sentiments *were not novel, but apostolical*; and that what they wrote down *was no discovery of theirs, but is the same as was taught by the apostles.*"¹

Similarly at the Council of Ephesus a letter from Capreolus of Carthage was read, in which he expressed his hope that the Fathers of the council "would drive away from the midst of the Church by the force of ancient authority new and strange doctrines, and in this way resist new errors, whatever they might be. . . . For whoever wishes that his decrees concerning the Catholic faith should remain in force for ever must confirm his opinion, not by his own authority, but by the judgement of the ancient Fathers; so that in this way, corroborating his opinions partly by the decrees and sentences of the ancients, partly by those of the moderns, he may show that he asserts, teaches, and holds the one truth of the Church coming down from the beginning to the present time in simple purity and in unconquered constancy and authority."² When this letter had been read to the council, the president, S. Cyril of Alexandria, said, "Let the epistle of Capreolus, the most reverend and most God-beloved Bishop of Carthage, which has been read, be inserted in the acts, since it expresses a clear opinion. For he desires that the ancient dogmas of the faith should be confirmed, and, on the other hand, that such as are novel, wantonly devised, and impiously promulgated, be reprobated and condemned." Then all the bishops cried out, "These are the words of us all: these things we all assert: this we all desire."³ S. Vincent of Lerins, commenting on these exclamations, says, "What do they mean, when they speak of 'the words of us all' and of the desires of us all, but that what has been handed down from antiquity should be retained, what has been newly devised should be rejected with disdain?"⁴

Two years after the Council of Ephesus, Pope Xystus III., writing

¹ S. Athan., *De Synodis*, § 5, *Opp.*, i. 575.

² Capreol. *Ep. i. ad concilium Ephes.* § ii., *P. L.*, liii. 845, 847.

³ Coleti, iii. 1077.

⁴ S. Vincent. Lirin. *Commonit.* cap. xxxi., *P. L.*, l. 682.

(A.D. 433) to John of Antioch about the condemnation of Nestorius which had been decreed by the council, said, "Let no more licence be allowed to novelty, because *it is not fit that any addition should be made to antiquity*. Let not the clear faith and belief of our forefathers be fouled by any muddy admixture."¹

To pass on to the condemnation of Eutychianism, decreed by the Council of Chalcedon in its own synodical definition, and by its acceptance of the tome of S. Leo, which agreed with that definition. Let us hear S. Leo's description of his own tome. Writing to S. Proterius of Alexandria in March, 454, he says, "There is no new doctrine (*praedicationis*) in my letter, which I wrote concerning the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ in reply to Flavian of holy memory, when he sent me a report against Eutyches; for in nothing did my letter depart from the rule of that faith which was manifestly maintained by our predecessors and by yours. And if Dioscorus had been willing to follow and imitate them, he would have remained in the body of Christ, having in the works of Athanasius of blessed memory the materials for instruction, and in the discourses of Theophilus and Cyril, [bishops] of holy remembrance, the means of laudably opposing a dogma which was long ago condemned, rather than of choosing to consort with Eutyches in his impiety."² A little lower down in the same chapter Leo says to S. Proterius, "And you must in such wise diligently exhort the laity, and clergy, and all the brotherhood, to advance in the faith, as to show that you teach nothing new, but that you instil into all men's breasts those things which the Fathers of revered memory have with harmony of statement taught, and with which in all things our letter [*i.e.* the tome] agrees. And this must be shown not only by your words, but also by actually reading aloud the statements made by those who went before, that God's people may understand that those things are now being taught to them, which the Fathers received from their predecessors and have handed on to their successors." That S. Leo regarded his teaching as being not only patristic, but also apostolic, is evident from an earlier sentence of this same epistle, in which he says to Proterius, "You laudably hold fast to the doctrine which has come down to us from the blessed Apostles and the holy Fathers."

The passages, which I have quoted, seem to me to make it clear that in passing the great synodical acts, by which the heresies of Arius, Nestorius, and Eutyches were condemned, and certain new formulas were established in opposition to those heresies, as obligatory tests of orthodoxy, the Church had no idea of making any substantial development in her doctrine. Her view was that she was resisting an innovating development, and was carefully re-stating in precise terminology the doctrine which she had held and taught from the first. That certainly was the account of her action which her representative men put forward. S. Leo, for example, evidently recognized that the laity had a right to have it proved to them that the new definitions against Eutychianism were in absolute agreement with the teaching of the Fathers; and Pope Xystus III. laid it down as an acknowledged principle that "it is not fit that any addition should be made to antiquity."

¹ S. Xysti III. *Ep.* vi. *ad Joann. Antiochen.* § 7, *P. L.*, l. 609.

² S. Leon. *Ep.* cxxix. *ad S. Proterium*, cap. ii., *P. L.*, liv. 1076.

Newman, in his treatise on *Development*, in which he does his best to be-little the witness of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Catholic faith, is nevertheless obliged to acknowledge "that there is not an article in the Athanasian Creed concerning the Incarnation, which is not anticipated in the controversy with the Gnostics." "There is," he adds, "no question which the Apollinarian or the Nestorian heresy raised, which may not be decided in the words of Ignatius, Irenaeus, and Tertullian." Newman quotes these words from one of his own earlier writings; but he adds, "This may be considered as true."¹

As regards the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the Jesuit, Petavius, is not uncommonly supposed to have taught in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters of his first book *De Trinitate*, as well as in other places, that some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers diverged in some respects from the Catholic faith in regard to that fundamental article. And Bishop Bull, in his admirable *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*,² and the brothers Ballerini in the Prolegomena to their edition of the works of S. Zeno of Verona,³ have roundly taken Petavius to task for the line which he has followed. Petavius' editor, Zaccaria, who also was a Jesuit, has warmly defended his wisdom and orthodoxy in reply to the animadversions of Bishop Bull, the brothers Ballerini, and others.⁴ For myself, I venture to think that Petavius has worded some passages of his first book very incautiously; but in justice to him attention ought to be called to the Preface, prefixed by himself to his *De Trinitate*, which preface, unless I am mistaken, is almost entirely ignored by Bishop Bull.⁵ In its pages he goes over the Ante-Nicene ground again and with very much more satisfactory results. After a careful discussion of the principal Ante-Nicene testimonies, he says, "By this abundance of most holy and most learned witnesses we trust that we have cleared our faith, and have abundantly fulfilled what was proposed at the outset; so that all might understand that belief in the Catholic dogma concerning the Trinity came down through the unbroken line and through what may be called the channel of tradition from Christ and the apostles to the Nicene times." Then he proceeds to admit that certain passages, in his opinion not altogether satisfactory, are to be found in the writings of *some* of the witnesses whom he has called. But he adds, "Etenim errores illi, ac labes opinionum privatarum, vel magis in loquendi modo, quam in re ipsa consistunt, ut saepe dixi; vel ad ipsam communis dogmatis substantiam non pertinent, sed ad quaedam capita illius, et consequentia decreta; vel denique in sola versantur interpretandi ratione, dum mysterii ipsius, fideique summam, in qua omnes

¹ Newman, *Development*, edit. 1885, pp. 13, 14.

² See Bishop Bull's *Prooemium* to his *Defensio* (§§ 7, 8, *Works*, edit. 1846, vol. v. part i. pp. 9-13).

³ Cf. Ballerini. *Prolegom. Opp. S. Zenonis*, Dissert. ii. cap. i. §§ i.-viii., *P. L.*, xi. 84-113.

⁴ See the *Appendicula Venetiani Editoris in qua brevis Petavianae doctrinae instruitur apologia*, ap. Petav. *Dogm. Theol.*, ed. 1865, ii. 279, 280.

⁵ Bossuet, in his *Sixième Avertissement sur les lettres de M. Jurieu*, § c. (*Œuvres*, edit. 1816, tom. xxii. p. 145), says, "Si j'avois à me plaindre de la candeur de Bullus, ce seroit pour avoir poussé le Père Pétav, sans presque faire mention de cette préface où il s'explique, où il s'adoucit, où il se rétracte, si l'on veut; en un mot, où il enseigne la vérité à pleine bouche."

invicem congruunt, alius aliter edisserit."¹ It follows, therefore, that in his final judgement Petavius' view in no way contradicts the position which I am defending.² In fact it is by no means necessary for my argument that I should be prepared to maintain either the accuracy in language or even the orthodoxy of *all* the ante-Nicene Church writers. It is sufficient that an adequate stream of tradition bears unmistakable witness to the faith of the Church in the Catholic dogma of the Trinity from the time of the apostles to the time of the Council of Nicaea.

Cardinal Franzelin has shown with great fulness of learning that "always and everywhere it has been held in the Church as a principle that the successors of the apostles are the guardians of the apostolic doctrine, to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be taken away." He says again that "it has always been a universal principle that whatever is new, if it is confounded with the deposit of faith, pertains not to the faith but to heresy." And he adds, "Hence apostolicity is a necessary mark of a doctrine of the faith."³

Again, Franzelin says, "As often as it has been defined that any article of doctrine belongs to the Catholic faith, it has always been understood that such action was altogether the same as defining that that revealed doctrine came to us from the Apostles either in divine Scripture or in unwritten tradition. . . . Hence all investigation of proofs was always reduced to this one thing, namely, whether the doctrine was contained in the Scriptures or in apostolical tradition; and this is clearly demonstrated by the acts of all the councils and by the history of all the definitions of faith. This very principle that nothing can belong to the revelation, which is to be believed by Catholic faith, unless it is contained in Scripture or in apostolical tradition, is presupposed by all theologians in their demonstrations, and is also expressly asserted by them." Franzelin refers to S. Thomas, Melchior Canus, Bellarmine, Gregory de Valentia, Suarez, De Lugo, and Benedict XIV.⁴

It is not of course for a moment to be supposed that these divines imagined that the decisions of later councils were, all of them, explicitly and *totidem verbis* contained either in Scripture or in apostolical tradition.

¹ Petav. *Praefat. in tom. secund. op. Theol. dogm.*, cap. vi. § i., *Dogm. Theol.*, edit. 1865, tom. ii. p. 277.

² Compare § cii. of Bossuet's *Sixième Avertissement* (*Œuvres*, tom. xxii. pp. 146-148), in which the Bishop of Meaux gathers together the main conclusions of Petavius' preface, and shows that "il est constant, selon le Père Pétav, que toutes les différences entre les anciens et nous dépendent du style et de la méthode, jamais de la substance de la foi." Cardinal Franzelin (*De Deo Trino secundum Personas*, sect. i. thes. x., pp. 152, 153) points out the discrepancy between Petavius' teaching in the first book of his *De Trinitate* and his later teaching in his *Prolegomena*. Franzelin adds, "Postiores theologi multi, et inter hos Natalis Alexander, Maranus, Lumpfer, Mochler (in *Opere Athanasius Magnus*) et ex Anglicanis Georgius Bullus locutiones vetustorum Patrum difficiliore interpretati sunt, non ut Petavius lib. i. sed alio sensu, qui conveniat cum ejusdem Petavii Prolegomenis; hancque suam interpretationem veram esse, ex ipsis Patrum principiis demonstrarunt, ita ut de pleno consensu doctrinae ante synodum Nicaenam cum professione synodi et patrum subsequentium quoad unam deitatem trium distinctarum personarum saltem inter theologos catholicos res videretur esse liquida."

³ Franzelin. *De Divina Traditione*, th. xxii., edit. 1870, pp. 233, 234.

⁴ Cf. Franzelin. *op. cit.*, p. 234.

But they did hold that the *substance* of those decisions was revealed to the apostles and was communicated by the apostles to the Church, to be by her continuously guarded, handed down, and taught; and they denied that the Church either needed or in fact received any fresh revelations in post-apostolic times to enable her to fulfil her duty in these respects.

If we compare the simple baptismal declaration of faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, which may have been all that was required from the catechumen in apostolic times, with the Nicene creed or with the Chalcedonian definition, we of course admit that a development of expression in obligatory formularies had taken place. We may compare such a development to the growth of the infant into a full-grown man, or to the up-springing of the oak tree from the acorn. But we should be under a complete misapprehension if we imagined that the Fathers of Nicaea or Chalcedon were imposing new doctrines on the Church. The whole substance of their definitions had been revealed to the apostles, and had been continuously handed on from generation to generation in the Church. The function of the Ecumenical Councils was to gather up into obligatory formulas the faith which had been traditionally taught, expressing in carefully chosen, precise words such portions of the deposit of apostolic tradition as needed from time to time to be authoritatively defined in opposition to the innovations of heretics. S. Vincent of Lerins, in the celebrated twenty-third chapter of his *Commonitorium*, in which he deals with the subject of doctrinal development, concludes his statement with the following weighty words. He says, "This, I say, is what the Catholic Church, roused by the novelties of heretics, has accomplished by the decrees of her councils—this, *and nothing else (neque quicquam præterea)*, she has thenceforward consigned to posterity in writing what she had received from those of olden times only by tradition, comprising a great amount of matter in a few syllables (*paucis litteris*), and generally, for the better understanding, designating the old meaning of the faith by the characteristic of a new name."¹

¹ S. Vincent. Lirin. *Commonit.* cap. xxiii., P. L., l. 669. It is to be noted that S. Vincent, having occasion to refer to the Church's decisive judgements on doctrine, which she was moved by the innovations of heretics to formulate, says nothing of any papal definitions, but speaks only of "the decrees of her councils." Of course S. Vincent was aware that leading bishops, whether at Rome, Alexandria, or elsewhere, had often had occasion to promulgate their official condemnation of newly devised false doctrines. Instances of such episcopal decisions abound in the history of the early Church. But though decisions of individual bishops or of local synods were regarded as weighty, especially when they emanated from the great apostolic or primatial sees, yet they were not, when taken by themselves, looked upon as decisive; whereas the decrees of a council, received by the Church as ecumenical, were regarded as being the utterances of the Church herself. The introduction into theology of the idea that papal decisions are final and irreformable is not a development in any sense. It is a revolution. So that even if, for the sake of argument, we allowed the right of enforcing under anathema substantial doctrinal developments to be attributed to the Church, it would not follow that the novel theory of papal infallibility could be made obligatory. Pius IX. rightly perceived that if, as he held, papal infallibility was a true doctrine, it was necessarily not only true but fundamental; it was, as he said, "*ipsum fundamentale principium Catholice fidei ac doctrinae*" (compare note 2 on p. 251). It is one thing to enforce corollaries which are evidently presupposed and implied in the traditional teaching of the Church, and it is a totally different

The development of a seed into a full-grown tree supplies an analogy which sets forth very well the growth of the Church's disciplinary regulations, and the progress which is attainable in many departments of theological science, and the increasing complexity of the expression of dogma in the Church's creeds and doctrinal definitions. But the development of a seed into a full-grown tree would be a very misleading parable, if it were used for setting forth the relation between the substance of the apostolic teaching and the substance of the Church's authoritative dogma in later times. The Church's duty is to guard the deposit of that substance, and to hand it on unchanged until her Lord's return, while at the same time she expresses and applies it in various ways according to the varying circumstances and needs of successive generations. The late Father Dalgairns, of the Brompton Oratory, has very well expressed this fundamental principle of the Church's action. "Christian truths," he says, "were thus planted whole like the trees in Paradise; they grew, they unfolded blossoms and they developed into fruit, *but they never sprang from seed.* If the principle [of doctrinal development] is to be of any scientific use, we must not be content with indistinct germs, any more than we could hope to satisfy a man who asked for an oak, by showing him an acorn."¹

The bearing of this immutable principle of the Church's action on the questions which may be raised as to her polity is very obvious. If the society founded by our Lord is at the present time rightly believed to be constituted *jure divino* as a monarchy, with the pope as her divinely empowered monarch, then that society has always been so constituted. The popes must always have enjoyed a divinely given primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church, and they must from the first have been endowed with the privilege of infallibility, when pronouncing judgement in regard to doctrinal controversies. Thoughtful Ultramontanes see clearly what is involved in the dogma, to which they are pledged by the Vatican decrees. Thus Cardinal Pitra repudiates the idea of "a slow progress of the Holy See" as being "rationalistic."² And the rulers of the Roman Communion in England are continually pressing upon us the primitive character of the Vatican teaching in regard to the papal prerogatives. Bishop Ullathorne, for example, in a letter addressed "to the Catholics of his diocese," says, "The pope always wielded this infallibility, and all men knew this to be the fact;" and he goes on to say, "The infallibility can only teach and enforce the unchangeable doctrines of the Church; what was always, everywhere, and by the concurrent Fathers held."³ Similarly Dr. Bilsborrow, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford, in his third lecture in reply to the Bishop of Manchester, says, "In their claims thing to bring in new fundamental principles, and thus make fundamental changes in the structure of the Church's creed. A fundamental change cannot be called a development. To speak plainly, a fundamental change is a heretical innovation.

¹ Dalgairns' *Essay on the Spiritual Life of the First Six Centuries*, being the introduction to the English translation of the Countess Hahn-Hahn's *Lives of the Fathers of the Desert* (p. l., edit. 1867).

² Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, p. 15.

³ Ullathorne, *The Döllingerites, Mr. Gladstone, and the Apostates from the faith*, p. 14.

to be the supreme and infallible teachers of Christendom, the Sovereign Pontiffs have made no advance from the Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians in A.D. 96 to the *Pastor Aeternus* of Pius IX. in our own days."¹ Leo XIII. says very much the same in his Encyclical, *Satis Cognitum*, on the Unity of the Church. His words run thus, "In the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age."²

Now, it is to show that the theory about the nature and authority of the papal primacy set forth by the Vatican Council was not "the venerable and constant belief" of the early ages of the Church, that this book of mine has been written. But while I feel constrained by the claims of truth to do what I can to make it clear that Bishop Ullathorne, Bishop Bilsborrow, and Pope Leo XIII. are mistaken in their opinion that the teaching of the Vatican Council is really primitive, I thoroughly sympathize with them in their desire to claim the witness of the early Church for the doctrine which they believe to be true and obligatory.

On the other hand, the writer of a review of the first edition of this book, which appeared in the *Tablet*, jauntily says, "Had the Vatican decrees been laid before S. Cyprian, likely enough he would not have recognized them as his own belief, or even the legitimate deductions therefrom."³ This of course is in plain contradiction with the assertion of Bishop Ullathorne that "the pope *always* wielded this infallibility, and that *all men knew this to be the fact.*" I have no doubt that the *Tablet* reviewer is right, and that Bishop Ullathorne is wrong, in the statements which they respectively make. But when I remember that both accept the Vatican decrees as infallibly true, I feel that Bishop Ullathorne's underlying principle is Catholic, while the reviewer's underlying principle is, to use Cardinal Pitra's word, "rationalistic," not to say—heretical.

I would strongly urge those who are interested in the question of doctrinal development to study with care the late Dr. Mozley's treatise on the *Theory of Development*, and Sir William Palmer's treatise on *The Doctrine of Development and Conscience*.

¹ See the *Catholic Times* for December 21, 1894.

² See the authorized English translation of the *Satis Cognitum*, pp. lv., lvi. : see also the Vatican decree itself (*Constit. Dogmat. Prim. de Eccl. Christi*, cap. iv., *Collect. Lacens.*, vii. 486).

³ See the *Tablet* for September 9, 1893, p. 408.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LECTURE I.

NOTE I (see p. 8). *On the date of the formation of the ecclesiastical province of Milan.*—In the course of the fourth century Milan became a metropolitan see, and Northern Italy ceased to belong to the ecclesiastical province of Rome.¹ It is not easy to determine the exact point of time when this change took place. It may be noted that the Council of Sardica, in 343, requests S. Julius of Rome to inform the bishops of Sicily, Sardinia, and *Italy* concerning its acts and definitions.² The term *Italy* in this passage cannot, I think, be limited to Central and Southern Italy, for the bishops from those parts, who subscribed the acts of the council, speak of themselves as coming respectively from Tuscia, Campania, and Apulia; whereas Protasius of Milan, Fortunatian of Aquileia, Severus of Ravenna, Ursacius of Brixia, and Lucius of Verona, who all belonged to Northern Italy, speak of themselves as coming “ab Italia.”³ These facts seem to indicate that at the time of the Council of Sardica Milan and Northern Italy remained still within the sphere of the pope’s metropolitan jurisdiction. Perhaps the metropolitan authority of Milan began during the episcopate of the Arian, Auxentius (354–374).⁴ S. Ambrose, who succeeded Auxentius, was undoubtedly a metropolitan; but we have no reason to suppose that it was in his time that the see became metropolitan. I would suggest that the consent of the see of Rome to the separation of Northern Italy from its province may have been granted, either by Felix II., who was nominated by Constantius and consecrated by Arians in 356, or by Liberius, at the time when he was yielding pliantly to the demands of that same Constantius (compare pp. 275–287). It can hardly be doubted that it was the residence of the Emperor at Milan which led to the elevation of its see to metropolitan rank. There is a certain ancient Latin version of the canons of Nicaea, in which it is stated that the Bishop of Rome has the care of the *loca suburbicaria*.⁵ If it were true, as Maassen⁶ supposes, that this version was brought back from the Nicene Council to Carthage by Bishop Caecilian, the position taken up by Duchesne, denying that Milan was a metropolitan see in the time of the Council of Nicaea, would be disproved; but I see no sufficient reason for accepting Maassen’s theory. Compare p. 185, note 2.

¹ Cf. Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, Introd., p. cxxix.

² Cf. Coleti, ii. 691.

³ *Ibid.*, ii. 692.

⁴ Compare Bacchini, a learned Benedictine, who seems to take this view in his *De Eccl. Hierarch. Origin.*, p. 346.

⁵ See canon 6, quoted on p. 139, note 1.

⁶ *Geschichte der Quellen des canonischen Rechts*, pp. 8–11.

NOTE 2 (see p. 9).—Bishop Lightfoot,¹ referring to the Roman Church in the time of S. Ignatius, speaks of “the prestige and the advantages, which were necessarily enjoyed by the Church of the metropolis.”

NOTE 3 (see p. 10).—On the special weight to be attached to the witness of the Apostolic Churches, see Tertullian, *de Praescript.*, capp. 20, 21, 27, 28, 32, 36; *de Virg. Veland.*, cap. 2; *adv. Marcion.*, lib. i. cap. 21; lib. iv. cap. 5.

NOTE 4 (see p. 12). *On the connexion between the ecclesiastical and the civil dignity of the three great cities of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch.*—The learned and pious Oratorian, Cabassutius, in his *Notitia Ecclesiastica*,² says, “Quia praeterea inter imperii Romani civitates primarias post imperii caput Romam, primo fulgebat dignitatis gradu Alexandria Aegypti, et secundo Antiochia Syriae ad Orientem; ideo [vivente Apostolo Petro] Romana ecclesia primum, Alexandrina secundum, Antiochena tertium sortita est nobilitatis gradum.” With the exception of the three words, “vivente Apostolo Petro,” which I have bracketed, this observation is very true. As regards the bracketed words, it would, I think, have been quite impossible for Cabassutius to have given any proof of his *thesis* that the Roman Church occupied the first place in the hierarchy, the Alexandrine the second, and the Antiochene the third, *during the lifetime of S. Peter*, in other words, before the destruction of Jerusalem. We know nothing about the series of obscure events which resulted in the placing of the bishops of the three great sees at the head of the hierarchy. To me it seems most probable that, either after the destruction of Jerusalem or after the death of S. John, the Roman bishop was naturally recognized as *primus inter pares*, but that it was not until towards the end of the second century that the informal suffrages of Catholics assigned to Alexandria and Antioch the second and third places.³ Dr. Rivington has adopted from some earlier Roman Catholic writers an astounding theory,⁴ according to which the see of Alexandria took precedence of the see of Antioch, because the Jewish Ethnarch of Alexandria “took precedence of all other heads of the Jewish people in their dispersion.” In the beginning of the last century the Benedictine, Bacchinius,⁵ started some such notion. He was refuted by the learned Ultramontane, Hierem. a Bennetis, in his *Privileg. Rom. Pont. Vindicata* (art. vii. prolegom., tom. iv. pp. 107–109). A Bennetis concludes his refutation thus: “Itaque ad formam Judaicae Reipublicae inducta, contemperataque regiminis ecclesiastici dispositio non tam perperam opinione fingitur, quam figmentum Divino consilio parum cohaerens, plurimumque indecens obtruditur.” Even if, for the sake of argument, one were to grant Dr. Rivington’s *thesis*, it would only afford a fresh example of the way in which matters unconnected with the supernatural order reacted on the order of precedence among the great churches of Christendom. If the Alexandrine

¹ *S. Clement of Rome*, i. 71, edit. 1890.

² *Dissert.* xiii., edit. 1680, p. 47.

³ Compare Duchesne, *Églises Séparées*, pp. 119, 120.

⁴ *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter*, pp. 125, 126.

⁵ *De Eccl. Hierarch. Origin.*, cap. iii. § 10, edit. 1703, pp. 226–229.

Ethnarch did take precedence of the Antiochene Archon, such precedence would be a matter of civil arrangement, not of divine appointment. I do not care to waste time and space in the refutation of a theory so improbable as that adopted by Dr. Rivington; but before finally quitting it, I would ask whether there is any reason to suppose that there were any Jewish Ethnarchs of Alexandria after the time of the Emperor Claudius (A.D. 41-54).

NOTE 5 (see p. 14). *All bishops, as successors of the Apostles, receive at their consecration jurisdiction which is ecumenical in its range.*—When I say that the Bishop of Rome had no actual jurisdiction outside of Italy, I do not forget that by their consecration all bishops become successors of the apostles, and have a habitual or, to use Vasquez's expression, a radical jurisdiction, which is ecumenical in its range. The exercise of that habitual jurisdiction is ordinarily restrained by the by-laws of the Church; yet, when the necessities of the Church really require it, a bishop may exercise his ecumenical jurisdiction outside his own diocese or province or patriarchate in abnormal ways. Naturally it was the bishops of the more important sees, whose aid was most frequently invoked by persons at a distance on occasions, when it was considered that the faith or fundamental discipline of the Church was in danger; and we should expect to find, and I think we do find, that the aid of the occupant of the primatial see of Rome was invoked more frequently than that of any other prelate. But the right of Stephen of Rome to meddle with the affairs of the Church of Gaul, when Marcianus, the Novatian, was Bishop of Arles, did not differ in kind from the right of S. Cyprian of Carthage to meddle with the affairs of the Church of Spain in the matter of Basilides and Martialis (compare pp. 55-61).

NOTE 6 (see p. 16). *Pope Victor did not claim to be able by his own authority to cut the Asians off from the common unity.*—Eusebius, describing Victor's action, says that he "endeavours to cut off" the Asian churches "from the common unity." Dr. Rivington paraphrases this by saying that Victor "decided, or at least threatened, to excommunicate the Asiatic churches 'from the common unity.'"¹ But to "endeavour" to do a thing is neither to "decide" to do it nor to "threaten" to do it.² If Victor had threatened the Asians that, unless

¹ *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter*, p. 41.

² Dr. Rivington, one must say it to his credit, does make some effort, however feeble, to do justice to the word *περιπαραι*. It is very unfortunate that Mgr. Duchesne, in his account of the incident (*Églises Séparées*, pp. 143, 144), through some extraordinary oversight, ignores the word altogether. His accuracy is so well known that I feel that such an assertion needs to be justified. I therefore quote the whole passage. Duchesne says, "Victor procède alors contre eux par voie d'excommunication: il les retranche de l'union commune, τῆς κοινῆς ἐνώσεως: c'est l'expression d'Eusebe. Il a donc conscience que lui, chef de l'Église romaine, il dispose de l'universelle communion, qu'il est en son pouvoir, non seulement d'interrompre ses relations avec un groupe ecclésiastique, mais de mettre ce groupe au ban de l'Église entière. Comment veut-on que nous parlions, si l'on nous interdit de désigner par le nom de chef de l'Église le dépositaire d'une pareille autorité?" It would be difficult to imagine a more disastrous paragraph

they kept the next Easter on a Sunday, they would be excommunicated, such a threat would not have been an attempt to cut them off, but rather an attempt to make it unnecessary to cut them off. The object of a threat is to produce obedience. Victor had threatened before, and the Asians had stood firm against his threats. In his opinion the time had now come for him to act. And he did act to the full extent of his power. His endeavour to cut off the Asians from the common unity took this form : he denounced them by letters to his brethren of the episcopate, and proclaimed that they were utterly separated from communion. There was a real separation from communion,¹ but obviously it did not go so far as to produce a cutting off from the common unity. That was the goal to be reached, but it was not yet reached. The Bollandist, Father de Smedt, describes the pope's action thus, "It seems that we must conclude that Victor deprived them [viz. the Asians] of *his own* communion (communione sua), and that he laid his injunctions on the other bishops to refrain from communicating with them."² I should myself suppose that Victor would hardly have ventured to *enjoin* a course of action on the universal episcopate. He more probably used terms of request and persuasion. However, the point to be noticed is that Father de Smedt describes Victor's action as a depriving the Asians of *his own* communion. Dom Coustant, in a passage already quoted (see p. 225, n. 2), takes the same view, and so does Tillemont (iii. 634).³

¹ There is great unanimity among the ancient authors who deal with this matter. They all, or almost all, imply that there was an absolute excommunication and not a mere threat. This is the view taken not only by Eusebius, but by S. Epiphanius, by Socrates, by Pope Nicholas I., and by Nicephorus Callisti. The fact is so evident that it is admitted by most learned Roman Catholics, such as Cardinal Baronius, the Jesuit Halloix, Archbishop de Marca, Schelstrate, Tillemont, Pagi, Bossuet, Dom Massuet, Dom Coustant, Roncaglia, Mansi, the Bollandist Bossue, and the Bollandist De Smedt. Newman, in his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* (p. 63), implies that he agrees with these great writers. He says, "Was S. Victor infallible when he separated from his communion the Asiatic churches? or Liberius, when in like manner he excommunicated Athanasius? . . . No Catholic ever pretends that these popes were infallible in these acts." Some few Romanist writers take the other view, and deny that Victor did more than threaten excommunication. Dr. Rivington in particular appeals (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 46) to the witness of S. Firmilian (see p. 438), who may be thought to imply that the Paschal controversy had never produced any disruption of communion. This argument has been by anticipation ably refuted by Father de Smedt (*Diss. Sel.*, pp. 74, 75), and before him by Mansi (cf. Natal. Alex. *Hist. Eccl.*, tom. v. p. 205, ed. 1786, Bing. ad Rhen.).

² *Dissertationes Selectae*, p. 73.

³ The fact that Victor limited himself to depriving the Asians of *his own* communion is highly important. It shows how futile is the argument in favour of the papal claims which some Roman Catholics draw from this whole episode. They say that no one disputed Victor's authority, but that even those who disapproved of his action did not go further than to remonstrate with the use he made of his authority. But why should any one dispute Victor's right to deprive certain persons of the communion of the Roman Church? Nobody denies that the Roman popes possess that right. What is denied is that they have the right to cut people off from the common unity of the Catholic Church ; and Victor did not claim to be able to do that. If he had thought that he could cut the Asians off from the Catholic Church, he certainly would have done so ; for he considered that they deserved to be cut off from that unity, and he did all that he could to get that punishment inflicted on them. The fact that he did not attempt to cut them off *by his own authority* from the common unity shows, under the circumstances, that he did not suppose that he possessed authority to do so.

NOTE 7 (see p. 17). *S. Firmilian probably followed the quartodeciman usage.*—S. Firmilian's words run as follows: "But that they who are at Rome do not in all respects observe the things handed down from the beginning, and that they in vain allege the authority of the Apostles, any one may know even from this, that concerning the paschal days which are to be celebrated, and concerning many other ordinances of religion (circa celebrandos dies Paschae et circa multa alia divinae rei sacramenta) he may see that among them there are certain variations, and that all things are not there observed in the same way as they are observed at Jerusalem; as in very many other provinces many things are varied according to the diversity of places and men; nor yet has there on this account been at any time any withdrawal from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church." It is evident that, according to S. Firmilian's view, the Roman Church had varied from the Apostolic tradition in the matter of the Paschal observance. To me his words seem clearly to allude to the quartodeciman question, and not to that later paschal controversy which was appeased by the Council of Nicaea.¹ Apostolic tradition could hardly have been invoked in favour of this or that paschal cycle, or for the purpose of determining such a question as whether Easter could or could not be kept before the equinox; whereas in the quartodeciman controversy both sides claimed to have derived their practice by tradition from Apostles. I do not think that S. Firmilian's words necessarily imply that on the particular question of Easter Rome differed from Jerusalem. If a divergence on that point is implied, then either S. Firmilian was mistaken, or he is not referring to the quartodeciman practice; for Jerusalem in his time was no more quartodeciman than Rome was. Of these two alternatives I should prefer to adopt the former. I feel convinced that S. Firmilian had the quartodeciman question before him. And the tone of the passage seems to me to imply that the usage of Caesarea, S. Firmilian's own church, differed from the usage of Rome. In other words, Caesarea in 256 still followed the quartodeciman tradition. In the time of Victor that tradition was followed, not only by the churches of Asia, but also by "the neighbouring churches," which may well have included the Christian communities of Cappadocia.² Both Asia and Cappadocia had given up their quartodecimanism before the time of the Council of Nicaea, as appears from Constantine's letter to the churches,³ written at the conclusion of the council. However, I am ready to grant that this argument, which I have based on S. Firmilian's words, is not absolutely decisive; and, if any one is not convinced by it, I fall back on the fact that readers of Eusebius would naturally conclude from his account that the Asian churches persevered in the practice which they inherited from S. John. If any one maintains the opposite view, the *onus probandi* lies on him.

¹ Compare Duchesne's article, entitled, *La Question de la Pâque au Concile de Nicée*, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for July, 1880 (tom. xxviii.).

² Baronius (*Annal.*, s.a. 258, § xlvi., tom. ii. p. 522, edit. Antwerp, 1617), speaking of S. Firmilian, with special reference to the passage which I am discussing, says, "Quis non videat ipsum stetisse a parte Quartodecimanorum."

³ Euseb., *Vit. Constantini*, lib. iii. cap. 19.

NOTE 8 (see p. 26). *On the meaning of conventio ad in 2 Cor. vi. 15 (Vulg.)*.—Not being able to discover any passage in which the verb *convenire ad* has the meaning *agree with*, our Ultramontane adversaries appeal to the Vulgate translation of 2 Cor. vi. 15, part of which runs thus, “*Quae autem conventio Christi ad Belial?*” Here we have the substantive *conventio*, which is derived from *convenio*, followed by the preposition *ad*. The question at once arises, Does the word *conventio* ever mean “agreement” in the sense of consent to another’s opinions or doctrines? Because, unless it has that meaning, it will entirely fail to help the ordinary Romanist explanation of *convenire ad* in the Irenaean passage. One must say in reply that neither Facciolati nor Lewis and Short recognize any such meaning as belonging to the word. Setting aside two technical uses of the word connected with law and marriage, *conventio* has two meanings. It may mean a “meeting,” or it may mean a “covenant” or “bargain.” I suppose, therefore, that the unknown Latin translator¹ of 2 Cor. vi. meant to say, “What communion hath light with darkness? and what covenant hath Christ with Belial?” That appears to be the only meaning which the Latin will bear. Whether that was S. Paul’s meaning is another question. S. Paul wrote, *Τίς δὲ συμφώνησις χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ*. Probably the Latin words *consensus* or *consensio* would best express the meaning which S. Paul attached to *συμφώνησις*. Estius felt the difficulty, and suggested that the Latin translator had really written *consensio*, and that *conventio* had crept into the text by the mistake of a copyist. This suggested emendation was ingenious, but in face of the evidence of the MSS. it cannot be accepted. No doubt the original translator, whoever he was, wrote *conventio*, and he probably selected that word because he misunderstood the meaning of *συμφώνησις*, as used in this verse. The fact is that *συμφώνησις*, which is a very rare word, does at times mean a “bargain” or “covenant;” just as the word *συμφωνέω* means at times “to strike a bargain” or “to make an agreement.” It happens that in the only other place in the Vulgate New Testament in which *conventio* occurs, it represents the Greek word *συμφωνέω*, which has in that passage the meaning “to make a bargain.” In S. Matt. xx. 2, the Vulgate reads, “*Conventionem autem factam cum operariis ex denario diurno,*” which corresponds to the Greek *συμφωνήσας δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐργατῶν ἐκ δηναρίου τὴν ἡμέραν*. For this meaning of the verb *συμφωνέω* see De Valois’ first note on Evagr. *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. i. cap. 2, and for the corresponding use of the noun *συμφώνησις* see Du Cange. The meaning “covenant” suits very well with the context in 2 Cor. vi. 15, although it is more likely that S. Paul meant “concord.” But “*conventio*” cannot mean “concord,” and as used here can, I think, only mean “covenant.”

It seems to follow from all this that the attempt to use 2 Cor. vi. 15, in order to justify the ordinary Romanist translation of *convenire ad* in the Irenaean passage, fails.²

¹ The word *conventio* in 2 Cor. vi. 15, came into the Vulgate from the *Vetus Itala*. S. Jerome did not retranslate the epistles, but somewhat sparingly revised the old version of them; and in the verse in question he retained the old wording unchanged.

² Even if the attempt had not failed, such a use of the word *conventio* would

NOTE 9 (see p. 27).—One may illustrate the combination of *undique* with *convenire ad* by the following passages in which *undique* is combined with the completely parallel expression *concurrere ad*. (1) The Council of Antioch (A.D. 341), in its ninth canon, says, "It is right that the bishops in each province should know that the bishop who presides in the metropolis receives also the care of the whole province, *because all who have business resort to the metropolis from all quarters*; wherefore it seemed good that he should enjoy precedence in dignity." In the old Latin translation of the canon by Dionysius Exiguus the italicized words are thus rendered, "Propter quod *ad metropolim omnes undique*, qui negotia videntur habere, *concurrunt*."¹ (2) S. Gregory Nazianzen, in the farewell oration which he delivered in the presence of the second Ecumenical Council, when he was resigning the bishopric of Constantinople, describes the imperial city thus: he calls it "the eye of the world . . . the bond of union between the East and the West, *to which the extremities of the earth resort from all quarters* (*πανταχόθεν συντρέχει*, i.e. *undique concurrunt*), and from whence they start afresh (*ἀρχεται*), as from a common emporium of the faith."²

NOTE 10 (see p. 31).—In the years 1892 and 1893, when this book was first written and when the first two editions of it were published, I held the view that S. Irenaeus, when he used the expression, "propter potentior^{em} principalitatem," was referring to the imperial status of the city of Rome rather than to the primatial position of the Church of Rome. In adopting this interpretation I could cite as agreeing with me many weighty authors, as for example Bishop Pearson,³ Bishop Stillingfleet,⁴ Dr. Salmon,⁵ the Abbé Guettée,⁶ Dr. von Döllinger,⁷ and Dr. Cyriacus,⁸ a learned ecclesiastical historian belonging to the Orthodox Church of Greece. Other learned writers have held that S. Irenaeus attributes the *potentior principalitas* to the Church of Rome rather than to the city of Rome. This is the view of Dr. Routh,⁹ Dr. Pusey,¹⁰ Dr. Bright,¹¹ Dr. Robertson,¹² and others. In my earlier editions I had admitted (p. 41), that "the disputed words would very naturally be referred to the Church which had just been mentioned," but the arguments in favour of referring the words to the city seemed to me at that time to prevail. Further

be an isolated phenomenon; and it would be a very illegitimate proceeding to explain the verb *convenire* in the Irenaeus passage from one exceptional instance of the use of the substantive *conventio* in a peculiar sense, when the ordinary meaning of *convenire ad* gives an excellent meaning to the passage.

¹ Dion. Exig. *Codex Canonum Ecclesiast.*, can. 87, *P. L.*, lxxvii. 161.

² S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xlii. cap. 10, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 755.

³ *De Success. Prim. Rom. Episc.*, I. xiii. 4, *Minor Theological Works*, edit. Churton, ii. 429.

⁴ *Rational Account*, part ii. ch. vi., *Works*, edit. 1709, iv. 423-426.

⁵ *Infallibility of the Church*, second edit., pp. 381-383.

⁶ *La Papauté Schismatique*, pp. 37-45.

⁷ *Considerations for the Bishops of the [Vatican] Council respecting the question of Papal Infallibility*, reprinted in *Declarations and Letters*, pp. 15, 16.

⁸ See *The Church Quarterly* for July, 1882, p. 313.

⁹ *Tres Breves Tractatus*, edit. 1854, p. 23.

¹⁰ Sermon on *The Rule of Faith*, appended note, p. 64.

¹¹ *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 31, 32.

¹² *Church Historical Society Lectures*, series ii. p. 218.

consideration has led me to change my opinion on this point, and I have consequently rewritten the whole of that part of my first lecture, which deals with the Irenaeus passage.

NOTE II (see p. 33). *On the Greek equivalents of the Latin principalitas in the great treatise of S. Irenaeus.*—The words *principalis* and *principalitas*, which fundamentally mean *first* and *firstness*, may be used in various connexions, and may gather round themselves various secondary notions, so that in different contexts they need to be translated by different English words, and similarly they may themselves represent in different passages different Greek words. Thus there are three passages in S. Irenaeus (viz. IV. xxvi. 2; V. xiv. 1; V. xxi. 1) where it seems to be generally admitted¹ that *principalis* represents the Greek ἀρχαίος in the sense of *original*. There is one passage (II. xxx. 9) where *principalitas* seems to be used of the angelic order of principalities as in Eph. i. 21, and where no doubt S. Irenaeus used S. Paul's word ἀρχή. There are two passages, both of them in III. xi. 8, where the original Greek of S. Irenaeus has been preserved by Anastasius Sinaita, and where *principalis* in the translation stands for ἡγεμονικός in the original. One may illustrate that translation by the 14th verse of the *Miserere* Psalm, where the *spiritus principalis* of the Vulgate corresponds with the πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικόν of the lxx. And again the regular Greek rendering of the title *Princeps*, as applied to the Emperor, was ἡγεμών, and in that connexion *principatus* was ἡγεμονία.² To go back to S. Irenaeus;—the translator in I. ix. 3 uses *principaliter* to represent προηγούμενος. There are eight passages in S. Irenaeus (viz. I. xxx. 8; I. xxxi. 1; II. i. 2; IV. xxxv. 4; also two passages in I. xxvi. 1; and two passages in IV. xxxv. 2), in which the author is discussing the Gnostic systems with their highly technical phraseology, and in which the translator uses *principalitas* to denote the supreme Deity, to whom some Gnostics gave the abstract appellation of "The Sovereign Power." In these passages I believe that S. Irenaeus used the word ἀθθεντία. This can be shown to be the case as regards the two passages in I. xxvi. 1, by a reference to the *Philosophumena* of S. Hippolytus,³ and as regards the passage in I. xxxi. 1 by a reference to Theodoret⁴ and to S. Epiphanius;⁵ and we may fairly presume that the same word ἀθθεντία is used in the other five passages, in which the supreme God, as set forth in various Gnostic systems, is spoken of in the Latin translation of S. Irenaeus as the *Principalitas*. Finally, there is one passage (viz. IV. xxxviii. 3) where the translator renders the word πρωτεύει by the expression *principalitatem habebit*, a rendering which suggests πρωτεία as the substantive, which in such a passage would correspond with *principalitas*.⁶

¹ Compare Dom Chapman's article in the *Revue Benedictine* for February, 1895, p. 55.

² See Mommsen's *Staatsr.*, II. ii. 733, note 6. I owe this reference to Professor H. F. Pelham's article in the *Journal of Philology* (vol. viii. p. 326).

³ S. Hippol. *Philosophum.*, vii. 33, and x. 21.

⁴ Theod. *Haer. Fab. Compend.*, i. 15, *Patrol. Gracc.*, lxxxiii. 368.

⁵ S. Epiph., *Haeres.* xxxviii. n. 1, *P. G.*, xli. 653.

⁶ Dom Chapman has rightly noted this point in the *Revue Benedictine* for February, 1895, p. 60, note 3.

Unfortunately, none of these passages has any great similarity to the passage in III. iii. 2, where a certain *potentior principalitas* is attributed to the Roman Church, and by implication a *potens principalitas* is attributed to other apostolical and metropolitical churches. If one is to be limited to words used or suggested by S. Irenaeus, I should be inclined to propose either *πρωτεία* or *ἡγεμονία* as the original word used in III. iii. 2; and on the whole I agree with Dr. Funk¹ and Dom Chapman² in giving the preference to *πρωτεία*. I do so because that word seems to keep closest to the fundamental meaning of *principalitas*, and to be a very suitable word to describe the pre-eminence of apostolic and metropolitical sees. But we cannot be sure that the word, used by S. Irenaeus in III. iii. 2, is one of the words used or suggested by him in other passages where his translator has given the rendering, *principalitas* or *principalis*. He may very well have used a fresh word in III. iii. 2. For example, he may have used the word *προεδρία*, as suggested by Dr. Routh.³ In any case the word must have been one which was fitted to express the pre-eminence and authority of the several apostolic churches, in their relation to the other churches of the regions over which they respectively presided.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LECTURE II.

NOTE 12 (see p. 40). *On the Angels of the seven churches.*—The angels of the seven churches are generally and, I think, rightly understood to mean the bishops of those churches. Among the Fathers, that view is taken by S. Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxv. § iii., *Patrol. Graec.*, xli. 324), Ambrosiaster (*Comment.* in 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9, 10, *Patrol. Lat.*, xvii. 253), S. Jerome (*Comment.* in 1 Tim. iii. 2, *P. L.*, xxx. 879), S. Augustine (*Ep.* xlii. cap. viii. n. 22, *P. L.*, xxxiii. 170), Socrates (*H. E.*, IV. xxiii. 69, ed. Hussey, tom. ii. p. 529), Cassiodorus (*Complex.* in Apoc. ii. 8, *P. L.*, lxx. 1406), Primasius (*Comment.* in Apoc. i. 20, *P. L.*, lxxviii. 803), and others; among mediaeval writers by S. Bede (*Explan.* Apoc. i. 20 et iii. 1, *P. L.*, xciii. 137, 140), Rupert (*Comment.* in Apoc. i. 20, *P. L.*, clxix. 864), Richard of S. Victor (*In Apoc.* lib. i. cap. iv., *P. L.*, cxcvi. 712), and also according to Petavius (*De Eccl. Hierarch.*, lib. i. cap. ii. § xv., *Theol. Dogm.*, tom. vii. p. 491, edit. 1867) by Cardinal Hugo de S. Caro, and Nicolas de Lyra; among Anglican writers by Ussher (*Opusc. de Episc. et Metropolitan. orig.*, edit. 1688, pp. 4-16), Hammond (*Annotations on the New Testament*, vol. iv. pp. 512, 513, edit. 1845), Pearson (*On the Creed*, art. ix., ed. Burton, Oxford, 1870, p. 598; *Vindic. Ignat.*, pars ii. cap. xi., p. 519, ed. Churton), Archbishop Trench (*Epistles to the Seven Churches*, edit. 1867, pp. 52-59), Dean Vaughan (*Lectures on the Revelation*, third edit., vol. i. p. 20), Doctors Westcott and Hort (*New Testament in Greek*, vol. ii. appendix, edit.

¹ *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 735.

² *Revue Bénédictine* for February, 1895, p. 60.

³ Routh, in his *Tres Breves Tractatus* (p. 21), expresses his opinion that "propter potentiozem principalitatem" may be fairly rendered into Greek thus: *διὰ τὴν ἐγκρατεστέραν προεδρίαν*. He gives a Greek rendering of the whole passage, heading it, "Interpretatio vetus nunc ex veteribus glossariis Graece reddita."

1881, p. 137), and others. As regards Romanist writers it is enough to say that Petavius (*loc. cit.*) asserts that the view, which we are considering, is the "communis sententia interpretum," and that the "recentiores non aliter exponunt;" and, if we come to writers of the present generation, Addis and Arnold (*Catholic Dictionary*, s.v. *Bishop*, p. 84, edit. 1887, New York) say that "the Angels of the Churches" "answer to the idea of diocesan bishops and to nothing else." Among Protestants the same view is maintained by Grotius (*Vot. pro pace contra Rivetum*, art. 7, edit. 1642, pp. 42-44), Bunsen (*Ignatius von Antiochien und seine Zeit*, edit. 1847, p. 85), and Godet (*Studies on the New Testament*, tr. Lyttelton, 1884, pp. 337, 338). I cannot help thinking that Bishop Lightfoot, who regards the "Angels" in Rev. ii. and iii. as the guardian angels of the churches, or else as their personification (*Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, edit. 1892, pp. 159, 160), and Mr. Gore, who follows Lightfoot (*Church and the Ministry*, edit. 1889, pp. 254, 255), have been misled by their assignment of an early date to the Apocalypse. For myself, I have never been able to accept the theory of the early date, and I am glad to observe that the more recent writers, including Harnack, Zahn, Ramsay, and Bousset, repudiate it.¹

NOTE 13 (see pp. 42 and 113). *In the Clementine romance S. James, not S. Peter, is the chief ruler in the Church.*—According to the Clementine romance, there is a chief ruler of the universal Church; but the holder of that office is not S. Peter, nor his Roman successor, S. Clement, but S. James, the Lord's brother, "the bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem, the holy Church of the Hebrews, and the churches everywhere excellently founded by the Providence of God."² S. Peter receives a charge from S. James to send him a written report of his discourses and of his proceedings year by year.³ Apostles, teachers, and prophets, who do not first accurately compare their preaching with that of James, are to be shunned.⁴ They are not to be believed "unless they bring from Jerusalem the testimonial of James, the Lord's brother, or of whosoever may come after him."⁵ James is styled "the archbishop."⁶ S. Peter says, "While we abode in Jericho . . . James, the bishop, sent for me, and sent me here to Caesarea."⁷ Altogether S. Peter is represented as quite subordinate to S. James. Before S. Peter leaves Caesarea to start on his missionary circuits, he consecrates Zacchaeus to be his successor at Caesarea, compelling him "to sit down in his own chair."⁸ The account of Zacchaeus' nomination and consecration to the bishopric of Caesarea⁹ is curiously like the consecration of Clement to the bishopric of Rome, as given in the letter to James. In both cases it

¹ I have tried to indicate in this note some of the great names that can be cited in favour of the identification of the angels of the churches with bishops; but it is only fair to warn beginners that even in the patristic period this identification was not universally admitted.

² *Epistle of Clement to James*, in the salutation.

³ See *Homilies*, i. 20, and *Recognitions*, i. 72.

⁴ See *Homilies*, xi. 35.

⁶ *Ibid.*, i. 73.

⁸ *Homilies*, iii. 63.

⁵ *Recognitions*, iv. 35.

⁷ *Ibid.*, i. 72.

⁹ *Ibid.*, iii. 60-72.

is a consecration to a local bishopric, and not to a monarchy over the universal Church. Taken as a whole, the Clementine romance is entirely un-Petrine and un-Roman.

NOTE 14 (see p. 43). *Duchesne on the "years of Peter."*—Duchesne, in his *Origines Chrétiennes*, says, "Les 25 années du pontificat romain de saint Pierre se heurtent à des difficultés assez graves." He adds in a note, "Le livre des Actes signale la présence de saint Pierre à Jérusalem vers la Pâque de l'an 44, puis en 51; il est à Antioche en cette année ou en 54. Il n'est pas à Rome au commencement de 58 (cette difficulté disparaît si l'on admet que les saluts de Rom. xvi. sont adressés à d'autres églises que celle de Rome);¹ ni en 61; les épîtres de S. Paul, écrites de Rome, ne le mentionnent jamais. Sans doute, tout cela n'est pas absolument inconciliable avec un séjour effectif de 25 ans, comportant nécessairement quelques absences; mais il est bien extraordinaire que ces absences tombent précisément à toutes les dates pour lesquelles nous avons des renseignements sur la chrétienté de Rome."²

NOTE 15 (see p. 46). *Bishop Lightfoot on the influence of the Clementine romance at Rome.*—Bishop Lightfoot says, "Whatever theory may be held respecting the dates and mutual relations of the Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, the original romance which was the basis of both cannot well be placed later than the middle of the second century; for, though originally written in Syria or Palestine (as its substance bears evidence), it had circulated so as to influence public opinion largely in the West before the time of Tertullian."³ In this last statement Bishop Lightfoot evidently has in view Tertullian's assertion that the Church of Rome relates that Clement was ordained by Peter. As far as I am aware, that is the only passage of Tertullian which throws any light on the question of the date of the romance, and it only does so on the supposition that the theory of Clement having been the first bishop of Rome and of his having been ordained by S. Peter was due to the circulation of the romance in the West. Bishop Lightfoot had touched on the same point in an earlier passage. He had said, "Though the date of this work [viz. the Clementine romance] cannot have been earlier than the middle of the second century, yet the glorification of Rome and the Roman bishop obtained for it an early and wide circulation in the West. Accordingly even Tertullian speaks of Clement as the immediate successor of S. Peter."⁴ As regards the date of the romance, Bishop Lightfoot had said in a still earlier passage, "The Clementine romance, which we find incorporated in the existing *Homilies* and *Recognitions* . . . must have been written soon after the middle of the second century."⁵ (On this last point see also note 6 on pp. 48, 49.)

NOTE 16 (see note 2 on p. 46 and also p. 49). *The misplacement of S.*

¹ For weighty arguments in favour of the traditional view that the greetings in Rom. xvi. are addressed to persons living in Rome, see Sanday and Headlam's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, pp. xcii.—xcv.

² Duchesne, *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 73.

³ *S. Clement of Rome*, i. 361.

⁴ *Ibid.*, i. 64.

⁵ *Ibid.*, i. 55.

Clement's name is to be traced to the influence of the Clementines.—In some of the early lists of the Bishops of Rome we find the names of Clement and Anencletus (*alias* Cletus) transposed. Thus the author of the first section of the Philocalian or Liberian catalogue gives the order of the bishops as follows: (1) Peter, (2) Linus, (3) Clement, (4) Cletus. There are some interesting observations on the subject of this author's mistake in an article which appeared in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for April, 1876.¹ The article was written by the learned Jesuit, Père Colombier. The writer says, "Mais à quoi attribuer son erreur? Fut-elle purement accidentelle? Il est permis de le supposer. Cependant on pourrait avec plus de vraisemblance attribuer cette transposition à l'influence de certaines pièces apocryphes qui circulaient alors en Orient. Rufin d'Aquilée nous a conservé une prétendue lettre de saint Clément à saint Jacques dont le but est d'apprendre à cet apôtre, mort en 62, comment sur la désignation de saint Pierre lui-même, Clément vient, en 67, ou plus tard, de monter le second au trône pontifical. Cette pièce, avec l'ignorance de Rufin prouve la tendance de certains Orientaux à rapprocher saint Clément de saint Pierre. Cependant, comme elle exclut saint Lin du second rang, elle ne peut expliquer complètement la série de notre auteur, Pierre, Lin, Clément. Nous retrouvons cette série telle quelle dans les *Constitutions Apostoliques*, recueil dont la rédaction définitive est postérieure à l'an 230,² mais dont bien des fragments remontent plus haut que cette date: 'Pour l'Église de Rome, disent les Constitutions, Lin, fils de Claudia, fut ordonné le premier par Paul. Moi Pierre, je sacrai Clément après la mort de Lin.'³ Est-ce dans cet endroit, est-ce dans quelque autre pareil, que notre auteur a puisé son opinion sur la place de saint Clément? il serait impossible de le dire. *Mais cela ne me paraît pas douteux, elle lui vient directement ou indirectement des hérétiques judaïsants qui cherchaient à grandir son autorité en faisant de lui le compagnon inséparable et le successeur immédiat de saint Pierre.*⁴ Cette tendance a produit toute une littérature apocryphe dont il nous reste encore de curieux débris." It is clear from this passage that the Père Colombier agrees with me in tracing to the Clementine romance the tendency to connect S. Clement as closely as possible with S. Peter, a tendency which has, as he thinks, affected the order of the bishops in the Philocalian catalogue, and which had undoubtedly exercised, directly or indirectly, a strong influence on Christian opinion in Rome, before Tertullian wrote his *De Praescript. Haeret.*

NOTE 17 (see p. 52). *On the meaning of S. Cyprian's words:—"ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est"* (S. Cypr. *Ep.* lix. § 14, *Opp.* ii. 683).—I am somewhat astonished to observe that Mgr. Duchesne, referring to this passage of S. Cyprian, says (*Églises*

¹ Tome xix. pp. 408, 409.

² The first section of the Philocalian catalogue seems to have been compiled in the year 234, and is attributed by Bishop Lightfoot (*S. Clement of Rome*, i. 259) and by most other modern critics to S. Hippolytus. It supplies, I think, the earliest authority for the Roman episcopate of S. Peter.

³ Cf. *Constitut. Apost.*, lib. vii. cap. 47.

⁴ The italics are mine.

Séparées, p. 145) that Cyprian “témoigne toujours du plus grand respect pour la chaire de Pierre, pour l’Église souveraine¹ (*principalis*), d’où procède l’unité de l’épiscopat.” Surely *procéda*, not *procède*, is the correct rendering of “*exorta est*.” To do Dr. Rivington justice, he translates “*exorta est*” rightly—“took its rise.”² In a note to this passage of his book, Dr. Rivington objects to my interpretation of “*Sacerdotalis unitas*.” He says that “S. Cyprian gives not the slightest hint that he is speaking of Africa only.” But over and over again “*collegium sacerdotale*” and similar expressions are used by S. Cyprian without any more particular limitation, of the African episcopate.³ As regards the passage under discussion, I have suggested (p. 51, n. 1) that S. Cyprian is referring to the whole body of *Western* bishops, not to the Africans only. Passing to the consideration of the meaning of the word “*principalem*,” it is to be noted that Dr. Rivington appears to think that it must mean “sovereign,” because Tertullian in his *De Animâ* (cap. 13) defines “*principalitas*” as “that which is over anything.” But Tertullian is defining the substantive, as he is using it in that passage. He himself uses the word differently in other passages. Much more may S. Cyprian use the adjective “*principalis*” in one of its usual senses, though not in the sense in which Tertullian uses the substantive in the *De Anima*. As Dr. Bright observes, “The *De Praescr. Haer.*, where *principalitatem* is opposed to *posteritatem*, is a likelier book than the *De Anima* to have been much in Cyprian’s hands.”⁴

NOTE 18 (see p. 54). *On S. Cyprian’s condemnation of Felicissimus’ appeal to Rome*.—Dr. Rivington curiously misapprehends the events connected with the journey of Felicissimus and his companions to Rome. He says that “S. Cyprian denounced in no measured terms a certain small body of schismatics who repaired to Rome in the hope of persuading S. Cornelius, the pope, that they were true bishops.”⁵ He evidently supposes that the five bishops, who consecrated Fortunatus to be the pseudo-bishop of Carthage of the party of Felicissimus,⁶ went with

¹ Archbishop Benson (*Cyprian*, p. 537) says very truly, “It is matter of grief when one finds a scholar like Duchesne led by the logic of his position to translate *principalis ecclesia* ‘l’église souveraine.’”

² *Prim. Ch.*, p. 58.

³ I am glad to see that Archbishop Benson, in the Introduction to his *Cyprian* (p. xxxvii.), interprets the expression—“*unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*,” as I do. He is speaking of the obscurity which hangs about the origins of Christianity in Africa; and he says, “It was and is vain to try to ascertain where and by what avenues the flood had poured in. Cyprian only knew that the ‘sacerdotal unity,’ the one order of bishops, traced to the ‘primal church’ of Rome.”

⁴ *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 45, n. I think myself that the words, “*unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*,” fix the sense of “*principalis*” in this passage. But I have no doctrinal objection to translating *ecclesia principalis*, “primatial church,” so long as the word “primatial” is understood of a primacy of honour and influence, and not of a primacy of jurisdiction. Compare Archbishop Benson’s Note on the meaning of *Principalis* (*Cyprian*, pp. 537-540). He shows that “sovereignty, ‘ruling power,’ is exactly what was *not* included, implied, or allowed in the term.”

⁵ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 67.

⁶ Dr. Rivington strangely enough asserts (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 67) that Fortunatus was made bishop over the Novatianists at Carthage. But this is a complete

that leader of sedition to Rome.¹ But there is no reason for supposing that any one of them was among the companions of Felicissimus. On the contrary, S. Cyprian seems rather to suggest a distinction between these bishops and the emissaries of Fortunatus who went to Rome. In one passage of his letter to S. Cornelius, after describing the crimes and false teaching of the party of laxists at Carthage, he says, "After all this, they yet, having had a pseudo-bishop ordained for them by heretics, dare to set sail, and to carry letters from schismatic and profane persons to the chair of Peter, and to the principal Church, whence the episcopal unity took its rise."² Moreover, we have no reason to think that the people who went to Rome represented those five bishops. S. Cyprian, writing to the Roman bishop, describes them as "having been sent as legates by Fortunatus their pseudo-bishop, carrying to you letters as false as he whose letters they carry is false."³ They were the legates of Fortunatus, not apparently of Privatus and his colleagues, who had consecrated Fortunatus.⁴ They went to Rome to announce that the pseudo-bishop had been set up against the bishops (*Ep.* lix. § 14). They asserted that this pseudo-bishop had been consecrated by twenty-five bishops (*Ep.* lix. § 11); there would, therefore, be no special need for them to prove that five particular bishops out of those twenty-five were true bishops. The "desperate and abandoned persons," of whom S. Cyprian speaks, were primarily the party of laxists, among whom Felicissimus was "standard-bearer,"⁵ and over whom Fortunatus had lately been consecrated bishop; while among their adherents were at least three of the Carthaginian presbyters, of whom two were named respectively Donatus and Gordius.⁶ It is true that in May, 252, an alliance was made between the party of Felicissimus and the five deposed or schismatical bishops, who were headed by Privatus, ex-bishop of Lambesis; and it is possible that, having been thus brought into connexion with the laxist faction at Carthage, they may have kept up their connexion with it afterwards; but we have no proof that such was the case. After Fortunatus was consecrated, he was deserted by nearly all his followers. The great majority of these deserters made their submission to the Church.⁷ It is

mistake. Maximus had been made bishop of the Carthaginian Novatianists (*Ep.* lix. § 9, tom. ii. p. 676), who were a party of rigorists. Fortunatus was bishop of the followers of Felicissimus, who were a party of laxists.

¹ See *Prim. Ch.*, p. 68.

² S. Cypr. *Ep.* lix. § 14, *Opp.*, ii. 683, "Post ista adhuc insuper pseudoepiscopo sibi ab haereticis constituto navigare audent et ad Petri cathedram adque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est ab schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre."

³ *Ep.* lix. § 16, *Opp.*, ii. 685.

⁴ It is true that in the passage quoted above the voyagers to Rome are described as carrying letters from schismatic and profane persons; so that they had letters from others besides Fortunatus. But the structure of the sentence seems to suggest that the *schismatici et profani*, who gave the letters, were not the same as the *haeretici* who consecrated the pseudo-bishop. Probably the other letters were written by the presbyters who belonged to the laxist faction, and who ruled it under Fortunatus.

⁵ *Ep.* lix. § 9, *Opp.*, ii. 676.

⁶ Cf. *Ep.* xiv. § 4, *Opp.*, ii. 512, and *Ep.* xliiii. §§ 1, 2, 3, *Opp.*, ii. 591, 592.

⁷ Cf. *Ep.* lix. § 15, *Opp.*, ii. 684.

scarcely probable that Privatus or any of his four colleagues took that course; but, as they had formed an alliance with the party of Felicissimus, when it was relatively large, they may not improbably have wished to disentangle themselves from it, when it was losing the great majority of its adherents. Certainly S. Cyprian does not seem to have had Privatus prominently before his mind, when, speaking of the "desperate and abandoned men," he says that, "knowing well their own guilt, they dare not come to us, nor approach the threshold of the Church."¹ For in a previous paragraph of his letter S. Cyprian had mentioned that Privatus had professed a wish to plead his cause before the council of Catholic bishops, which had met in Carthage on the previous 15th of May, but that he had not been allowed to do so.² On the whole it seems highly improbable that any of the five consecrators of Fortunatus formed part of the embassy to Rome,³ and it is doubtful whether, when S. Cyprian wrote his letter to Cornelius, they were still in alliance with the "desperate and abandoned" faction of Felicissimus. It is primarily about Felicissimus and his faction that S. Cyprian is speaking in the important passage, quoted on p. 53, which must now engage our attention.

In that passage, so far as I have quoted it in the text, S. Cyprian is dealing entirely with the question whether it was proper that the matters connected with Felicissimus, Fortunatus, and their adherents should be dealt with in Africa or in Rome. He gives various good reasons why "it behoves those over whom we are set not to run about from place to place, nor, by their crafty and deceitful boldness, break the harmonious concord of bishops, but there to plead their cause, where they will have both accusers and witnesses of their crime." Then he adds the important words: "*Unless perhaps some few desperate and abandoned men count as inferior the authority of the bishops established in Africa, who have already given judgement concerning them.*"⁴ Dr. Rivington wholly mistranslates and misunderstands this passage. He renders it thus: "Unless the authority of the regular (*constitutorum*) bishops in Africa seems less than [that of] a few desperate and abandoned men."⁵ The translation is based on the theory that the "desperate and abandoned men" were bishops. Dr. Rivington says in the text of the same page of his book, "These men themselves were neither legitimate bishops nor numerous. They were desperate and abandoned men and few." But we have already seen that this theory is erroneous. Regarding them in the mass, it would be true to say that the "desperate and abandoned men" were not bishops, although no doubt they had at least one bishop, Fortunatus, among them. Dr. Rivington wishes to make out that S. Cyprian is not denying by implication the inferiority of the

¹ *Ep.* lix. § 16, *Opp.*, ii. 686.

² Cf. *Ep.* lix. § 10, *Opp.*, ii. 677.

³ Mgr. Duchesne (*Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 426) speaks of this embassy in the following terms: "Felicissimus et quelques-uns des siens partirent pour Rome."

⁴ *Ep.* lix. § 14, *Opp.*, ii. 683, 684, "Nisi si paucis desperatis et perditis minor videtur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, qui de illis jam judicaverunt."

⁵ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 69, n. 2.

authority of the bishops in Africa, when compared with the authority of bishops elsewhere, and specially when compared with the authority of the Bishop of Rome. The view which he suggests is that the comparison lies between the authority of the regular bishops in Africa and the authority of the irregular bishops, Privatus and his colleagues. He therefore translates "episcoporum in Africa constitutorum," "the regular bishops in Africa." But this is an impossible rendering. The phrase is one which is constantly used by Cyprian, and the parallel passages show clearly that the words must be translated, "the bishops established in Africa."¹ There is no comparison between regular and irregular bishops, but between African and Italian bishops. Nor is there any need to resort to the theory of an "ellipse," and to insert the bracketed words "[that of]." The translation of the passage, as it stands, runs perfectly smoothly, and it requires no doctoring of any kind.² It is highly creditable to Archbishop de Marca of Paris that he adopts the straightforward explanation of S. Cyprian's words, and points out how this passage, taken with the circumstances which led up to it, illustrates the primitive discipline of the Church, which forbade appeals from the judgement of provincial synods. He says, "Cyprian, therefore, when, in accordance with the decision of his [provincial] council, he had rejected from his communion certain clerks and a certain pseudo-bishop of the heretics, gets indignant with Cornelius, the Roman bishop, because, when those persons had gone to Rome, the pontiff had hesitated for some little while whether he would receive them to his communion. In consequence Cyprian openly sets forth in a letter to Cornelius the rights of the bishops of each province, which consist in this, that to them belong the examination and decision of causes, and the government of their flock, they having to give an account of their administration to God ; and that it is not lawful to appeal to Rome or elsewhere ; and that the authority of the

¹ Compare *Ep.* xliii. § 3, *Opp.*, ii. 592, "universis episcopis vel in nostra provincia vel trans mare constitutis;" and *Ep.* lxvii. § 6, *Opp.*, ii. 741, "episcopis in toto mundo constitutis;" and *Ep.* lxviii. § 2, *Opp.*, ii. 744, "ad coepiscopos in Gallia constitutos;" and *Ep.* lxxii. § 1, *Opp.*, ii. 776, "ad Quintum collegam nostrum in Mauretania constitutum."

² As Dr. Rivington's translation, or rather mistranslation, is based upon an erroneous theory, there is, strictly speaking, no need to discuss another point which he raises. However, I will say something about it. Dr. Rivington supposes that the expression "minor auctoritas," attributed hypothetically by S. Cyprian to the schismatics, refers to their plea that the African bishops who condemned them were too few in numbers. But S. Cyprian has not yet hinted at that plea. Through the whole of the latter portion of the fourteenth paragraph (ed. Hartel) of his letter, S. Cyprian is insisting that the schismatics ought to plead their cause at Carthage and not at Rome. It is not until he reaches the fifteenth paragraph that he touches on the question of numbers, and mentions the fact that "if the number of those [bishops] who judged in their cause last year be reckoned, and there be added thereto the number of presbyters and deacons, [it will be found that] more were then present at the hearing and judgement than these same persons amount to, who appear now to be joined with Fortunatus." I cannot agree with Dr. Rivington in thinking that "the Oxford edition is doubtless correct in including this sentence in § 14." It seems to me that the more modern editors, Migne and Hartel, were well advised when they rejected that arrangement. However, my argument in no way depends on the question of arrangement.

African bishops is not inferior to the authority of the other bishops."¹ The historian, Aubé, after giving an account of this incident, and after quoting the passage from S. Cyprian's letter to S. Cornelius, which we have been considering, says, "On ne saurait trouver un texte plus formel, et de date plus précise, ni d'authenticité plus incontestable pour établir l'indépendance des grands sièges épiscopaux en face du siège de Rome au milieu du iii^e siècle. En dehors de cette thèse, du reste, toute cette lettre de Cyprien ne se comprend plus."² Assuredly one may say with confidence concerning the passage quoted from De Marca, and also concerning the passage quoted from Aubé, "This witness is true."

NOTE 19 (see p. 55).—The Emperor Philip, according to a very respectable tradition, was a baptized Christian (see Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'Empire Romain*, pp. 467-488); and in any case the Church enjoyed a profound peace during his reign. One of the seven bishops was S. Trophimus, the first Bishop of Arles (see Duchesne, *Fastes*, tom. i. p. 101).

NOTE 20 (see p. 56).—On the appearance of the metropolitan system in Gaul at the end of the fourth century, see Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 31, and also *Fastes*, tome i. pp. 89, 90, 103; but compare also pp. 31, 101, which seem to suggest that Marseilles and perhaps Arles enjoyed a certain metropolitan authority earlier in the century. See also the remarks of the Ballerini in their *Observationes in Dissert. quint. Quesnell.*, pars ii. cap. v. (*Opp.* S. Leon., *Patrol. Lat.*, tom. lv. col. 607 et seq.), and in their disquisition, *De Antiq. collection. et collector. canonum*, pars i. cap. v. § 4 (*Opp.* S. Leon., *Patrol. Lat.*, tom. lvi. coll. 43, 44).

NOTE 21 (see p. 57).—"Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelate consistentem a te litterae quibus abstento Marciano alius in loco ejus substituatur et grex Christi qui in hodiernum ab illo dissipatus et vulneratus contemnitur colligatur." The word "quibus" depends on "substituatur" and "colligatur." Even if one were to grant that, so far as grammar is concerned, it might depend also on "abstento," yet it is clear that in fact it does not depend on "abstento," because S. Cyprian has already implied in the previous paragraph that the duty of excommunicating Marcianus belonged to the bishops of Gaul. In any case, the ablative "quibus" denotes in this passage a remote and not an immediate instrumentality. One may describe the case of "quibus" as the *ablativus causae moventis*. Stephen's letters would not directly gather together the scattered flock. That gathering would be a remote result of the consecration of the new bishop, which consecration would itself be a remote result of the pope's

¹ De Marca, *De Concord. Sacerd. et Imp.*, lib. vii. cap. i. § iii., coll. 987, 988, edit. 1708). It may be worth noting that S. Cyprian carried out his doctrine about the finality of provincial decisions, in the advice which he gave to the Spanish churches in connexion with the case of Basilides and Martialis (see pp. 59-61).

² Aubé, *L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du iii^e siècle*, p. 272, n., edit. 1886.

admonitions. It would seem that S. Cyprian is urging Stephen to write three letters, one to the bishops of Gaul, pressing on them the duty of excommunicating Marcianus; one to the lay people of Arles, pointing out that, when Marcianus has been excommunicated, it would become their duty to elect a successor; and one to the bishops of *Gallia Narbonensis*, the province in which Arles was situated, and which was called "the Provincia" *par excellence*, urging them to come to Arles, and to preside at the election, and to consecrate the bishop elect. When the election and consecration had taken place, Stephen would of course be informed of the name of his new colleague.

NOTE 22 (see p. 58). *The episode of Marcianus supplies no confirmation of the papalist theory.*—If any one wishes to see a discussion of the episode of Marcianus of Arles from an Ultramontane point of view, let him refer to Dr. Rivington's *Primitive Church and the See of Peter*, pp. 70-72. Dr. Rivington on p. 75 actually says, "It is astonishing how any one could fail to see in the affair of Marcian of Arles an emphatic testimony to the strictly papal method of government as existing in the Church at that time, and taken for granted by S. Cyprian." But one must not suppose that all Ultramontane writers give expression to such wild views. It is a pleasure to quote by way of contrast the candid words of a really learned Vaticanist writer like Professor Funk. Speaking of this case of Marcianus, he says, "I cannot see in this an evidence of the Roman primacy, and therefore cannot on *this* ground regard it as undeniable 'that Cyprian here concedes to the successor of Peter the ordinary and immediate jurisdiction over external dioceses, and therefore over the whole Church.'¹ The case of Bishop Marcianus of Arles proves in my eyes only the primatial position of the Roman Church in the West,² and to realize this we need only ask how Cyprian would have acted had a similar case occurred in Africa. If I am not quite mistaken as to his character and his Church principles, there can be no doubt that he would have done, as supreme metropolitan (Obermetropolit) what he here advises the pope to do, and what he had himself already begun, and probably carried out, in the case of Fortunatianus, Bishop of Assuras (*Ep.* 65). Just as little as the one case compels us to assign the primacy of the universal Church to Cyprian, so little is the other an evidence of Roman primacy."³

NOTE 23 (see p. 61).—Dr. Rivington discusses the case of Basilides and

¹ These words between marks of quotation are cited by Dr. Funk from Peters, *Der heilige Cyprian*, p. 479. One of Dr. Peters' comments on this episode of Marcianus is characterized by Archbishop Benson (*Cyprian*, p. 319, n. 1) as "shameless."

² Though no one would deny that the Roman Church enjoyed a primacy of honour and influence in the West, yet it would perhaps be more accurate to say that this letter of S. Cyprian to Stephen proves that in the third century Rome exercised metropolitan authority, not only over Italy, but also in a measure over the infant churches in Gaul, which had been founded by missionaries who had been sent forth from Rome (compare pp. 55, 56).

³ *Theologische Quartalschrift* for 1879, p. 149. I owe the quotation from Dr. Funk's article to the kindness of the Rev. E. W. Watson of Salisbury.

Martialis in his *Primitive Church and the See of Peter* (pp. 72-75). It will, I think, be sufficient if I refer to two of his observations. On p. 73 he says, "The probability is, as Baronius thought, that" the two bishops, Sabinus and Felix, who had been substituted by the Spanish episcopate for Basilides and Martialis, "were sent to Rome [by S. Cyprian] with the [African] conciliar letter to help towards their acceptance by the pope." No doubt, on Ultramontane principles that would have been a not unnatural course to adopt; but there is not the slightest trace of any such mission in the conciliar letter. S. Cyprian and his colleagues give their decision against Basilides and Martialis absolutely, and in no way suggest that it will need ratification at Rome before it can rightly influence the action of the Church in Spain. Moreover, if they had wished to induce the pope to modify his action, they would surely have written a very different letter. As Mgr. Duchesne observes, "The synodal letter of the African council . . . was not worded in such a way as would be likely to please the pope."¹ Evidently Dr. Rivington in his heart of hearts agrees with M. Duchesne, for he says on p. 75, "It looks as if it would not be difficult for the Evil One to produce a rupture between these two saints. . . . 'Coming events [that is, the quarrel about the validity of heretical baptism] cast their shadow before.'" If S. Cyprian had been an Ultramontane, he would have sent the two bishops straight to Rome to plead their cause before Stephen. Not being an Ultramontane, but a sound Catholic, he sent them back to Spain with a letter bidding the Spanish Church pay no attention to the Roman decision in favour of the apostates.

But Dr. Rivington makes another observation. He says, "Not a word has S. Cyprian to say against the possibility of a bishop being replaced in his bishopric by the pope."² But why should S. Cyprian say anything on the matter? We have no proof that Stephen had ventured to claim the right of restoring Basilides to his bishopric. It is to me a far more probable supposition that the pope contented himself with admitting Basilides to the communion of the local Roman Church.³ Such a course was bad enough, and S. Cyprian does well to warn the Spanish bishops against imitating it, and to point out the guilt of any who should do so. But the pope's action, though faulty, was not invalid. It no doubt took effect at Rome, but it did not necessarily involve any invasion of the rights of the Spanish Church. It was a case for fraternal admonition in a letter to Stephen, rather than of protest on the score of invalidity in a letter addressed to the Spanish Christians.

¹ *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 428.

² *Prim. Ch.*, p. 74.

³ No doubt, when Basilides went to Rome, his ultimate aim was "to be replaced unjustly in the episcopate from which he had been rightly deposed." But we have no proof that he expected Stephen to replace him. If he could get Stephen to admit him to communion, and to give him a letter certifying that he had been so admitted, he might carry such a document back to Spain and might use it there with good effect, with the object of bringing about his restoration to his bishopric. On p. 74 Dr. Rivington himself says, "We do not know . . . what exactly his [Stephen's] judgement was." Precisely so. And until we do know, there is very little force in Dr. Rivington's argument.

NOTE 24 (see note 1 on p. 62).—The African custom of rebaptization seems also to have been followed at Antioch and in Syria, but not in Palestine. The Church in Palestine on this point, as on so many others, appears to have followed the lead of Alexandria. Compare Duchesne, *Origines Chrétiennes*, pp. 432, 433. But see note 3 on p. 461.

NOTE 25 (see note 3 on p. 62). *On the nationality of the author of the treatise, "De Rebaptismate."*—Archbishop Benson (*Cyprian*, pp. 394, 406) is quite convinced that the author of the treatise *De Rebaptismate* was not an Italian, but an African. He appeals to the fact that the author never refers to the tradition of the Roman Church, and also to his use of African idioms. I do not venture to contest the Archbishop's conclusion; but I feel a difficulty in understanding how an African bishop, writing about the year 255, could appeal, as he does (cap. i.), against Cyprian to "the venerable authority of all the churches," and to "the ancient and memorable and most solemn observance of all the holy and faithful men who have deserved well," without saying a word about the fact that his own African Church was committed to the practice of rebaptizing by the Council of Carthage under Agrippinus, held about forty years previously. Might not the writer be one of the Spanish bishops? One ought to know whether African idioms and speech were confined to Africa.

NOTE 26 (see note 4 on pp. 62, 63). *Before the Council of Alexandria in 362, S. Athanasius disallowed the validity of Arian baptism.*—Dr. Rivington, speaking of the passage from S. Athanasius (*Orat. ii. contr. Ariann.*, § 42) quoted by me on p. 62, says that "S. Athanasius does not deny the validity of baptism by heretics, but its sanctifying effects."¹ Newman, on the other hand, in his note *in loc.*, says, "The *primâ facie* sense of this passage is certainly unfavourable to the validity of heretical baptism."² In the succeeding paragraph S. Athanasius classes Arian baptism with that of the Paulianists and other heretics, who used the three Divine Names, but "not in a right sense," "nor with sound faith." Now, the Council of Nicaea in its 19th canon, had expressly ordered that Paulianists, who wish to return to the Catholic Church, should be rebaptized. As Hefele says, "The Council of Nicaea, like S. Athanasius himself, considered their baptism as invalid."³ Thomassinus understands the passage quoted from S. Athanasius about Arian baptism as I do. He thinks that S. Athanasius looked on that baptism as invalid.⁴ The same interpretation of the Athanasian passage is adopted by the Bollandist, Father Bossue,⁵ and by Dr. von Döllinger.⁶ The reader is also

¹ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 78, n.

² It should be noted that S. Athanasius wrote his second Oration against the Arians before the year 362, the date of the celebrated Council of Alexandria. Had the Oration been written after that date, the passage which we are considering would not improbably have been differently worded. On the action taken at the council of 362 in reference to Arian baptism, see note 1 on p. 454.

³ Hefele, i. 431, E. tr.

⁴ Thomassin. *Dissertat. ad Synodos sub Stephano Papa*, § xl., *Patrol. Lat.*, iii. 1291, 1292.

⁵ *Acta SS.*, tom. xii. Octobr., p. 499.

⁶ Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus*, p. 179, E. tr.

referred to the full note in Dr. Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 130, 131.¹

NOTE 27 (see note 4 on p. 63).—It seems to me clear that in the last paragraph of *Ep.* lxxii., S. Cyprian is giving expression to his expectation that Stephen would refuse to change the custom of his Church. Aubé takes the same view.² The Ultramontane, Jungmann, thinks that it cannot be doubted that S. Cyprian, when he wrote this letter to Stephen, knew that the Roman Church disagreed with him on the baptismal question; and that his object was to induce the pope to treat the matter as appertaining to discipline rather than to doctrine, and as being a point on which each bishop might feel free to follow his own opinion.³

NOTE 28 (see p. 64). *Stephen's threats of excommunication were received at Carthage before the final council on baptism.*—Dr. Rivington thinks that Stephen's harsh reply to the synodical letter of the second Cyprianic council on baptism did not arrive at Carthage until after the third council was concluded. He bases his theory on certain arguments. A summary of each of these arguments will be found below, printed in italics. To the summary of each argument I have appended my reply.

I. *Stephen's letter is not once mentioned in the Sententiae Episcoporum, which were delivered at the third council on baptism, and have been preserved for us by S. Augustine.*⁴

To this argument I answer that it would have been most unwise of S. Cyprian if he had read out at the council those remarks of Stephen, which he considered to be "arrogant, beside the purpose, and self-contradictory."⁵ We know that Stephen called S. Cyprian "a false Christ," "a false apostle," "a deceitful worker;"⁶ and it is quite possible that those abusive terms may have found a place in this very letter. Whether this was so or not, the letter contained "arrogant" remarks and threats of excommunication; and if it had been read it would necessarily have been inserted in the acts, and would have been sent all over Africa. For the sake of Stephen, and still more for the honour of the Catholic Church, it was important to prevent such a publication. S. Cyprian considered that, when he was presiding over a council, one of his duties was to

¹ Dr. Gwatkin, however, admits that the Council of Alexandria of the year 362 did not require the rebaptism of Arians. It would seem that S. Athanasius, who in principle rejected Arian baptism, thought it permissible, for the sake of unity at that very critical moment in the Church's history, to receive back into the Church, without rebaptizing them, those who had been baptized by Arians. S. Eusebius of Vercellae would hardly have consented to the Alexandrine decrees if they had required Arians to be rebaptized. Even Lucifer accepted Arian baptism. In the East the admission of Arians without rebaptizing them became the rule, as may be seen by referring to the so-called seventh canon of the second Ecumenical Council.

² Aubé, *L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du iii^e siècle*, p. 323, edit. 1886.

³ Cf. Jungmann, *Dissertationes Selectae in Hist. Eccl.*, tom. i. p. 325, edit. 1880.

⁴ See *Prim. Ch.*, p. 89.

⁵ *Ep.* lxxiv. ad Pompeium, § I, *Opp.*, ed. Hartel, ii. 799.

⁶ *Ep.* S. Firmil. inter Cyprianicas lxxv. § 25, *Opp.*, ed. Hartel, ii. 827.

put obstacles in the way of the ill-advised publication of documents which would cause scandal. It was on this principle that at the Council of Carthage, held in April, 251, before the consecration of Pope Cornelius had been recognized in Africa as legitimate, S. Cyprian refused to submit to the council the charges against Cornelius which had been forwarded from Rome. He himself has explained the principle on which he then acted. In his 45th Epistle he says, "We rejected those bitter accusations which the adverse party had heaped together in a document transmitted to us; considering and also reflecting that in so great and solemn an assembly of brethren, when the bishops (sacerdotibus) of God were sitting together and the altar was set, such things ought neither to be read nor heard. For those things should not without hesitation be put forward nor be incautiously and indiscreetly published, which, written with a contentious pen, may occasion scandal to the hearers and perplex with uncertainty brethren at a distance and living across the seas."¹ It can hardly be doubted that Cyprian would consider that the principles which had led him to suppress the publication of the accusations against Cornelius, were also applicable to Stephen's diatribe against himself, a diatribe which Bishop Hefele describes as "this violence of Stephen's,"² and which Father de Smedt calls an "acris epistola."³

If Stephen's letter was not read to the council, it is quite conceivable that a large number of the African bishops may never have seen it; and in any case, if it was determined that the letter should not be published, they would refrain from making any explicit allusion to it in the public sessions of the council, when the inferior clergy and "a very great part of the laity" were present.

2. *The speeches of the bishops do not show the irritation which we should have expected, if they had seen Stephen's letter.*

But, on the other hand, it must be remembered, in the first place, that the *sententiae* of the bishops were not speeches in the ordinary sense of the word. They were the judicial utterances of the Fathers of the council, and they kept strictly to the point which was under adjudication, namely, the question of the validity or invalidity of heretical baptism. And, in the second place, if it was determined that S. Stephen's letter should not be published, the bishops would be on their guard against any open exhibition of irritation, when they spoke at a public session. Moreover, S. Cyprian, in his opening address, as president, had urged the bishops to declare their opinion on the baptismal question freely, but "to judge no man" ("neminem judicantes"). Nevertheless, S. Cyprian gave to himself in that opening address some larger measure of liberty of speech, and to me his state of irritation is most patent. However, of that more later on. At the end of the session, when he delivered his *sententia*, he preserved the same judicial calmness as his colleagues.

3. *Only two bishops dealt with Stephen's main argument about custom.*

¹ *Ep. xlv. ad Cornelium*, § 2, *Opp.*, ed. Hartel, ii. 600, 601.

² Hefele, i. 101, E. tr.

³ De Smedt, *Dissertationes Selectae*, p. 233.

As Stephen's angry letter has not been preserved, we cannot say for certain what his main argument was. And in any case it would be quite in accordance with what we should expect, that the bishops in their short *sententiae* should, as a rule, set forth the positive grounds for their own practice rather than spend their limited time in refuting the arguments of their opponents. Moreover, it is not correct to say that only two of the bishops at this final council dealt with the argument from custom. If any one reads the *sententiae* with care, he will see that at least four of the bishops handle the topic of *custom*, namely, Castus, of Sicca (28), Libosus of Vaga (30), Felix of Bisica Lucana (63), and Honoratus of Thucca (77); and to these four S. Augustine would add a fifth,¹ for he considers that Zosimus of Tharassa (56) dealt with that same topic.

4. S. Augustine does not suppose that the bishops were answering Stephen.

As I have already pointed out, there is no reason to think that the bishops were making any special allusion to Stephen's letter. Perhaps many of them had not seen it.² On the other hand, it seems clear to me that S. Cyprian had Stephen's letter in mind. But S. Augustine had never seen S. Cyprian's letter to Stephen nor S. Firmilian's letter to Cyprian,³ and without those two letters it would be very difficult to settle accurately the chronological sequence of the documents, and to solve several of the difficulties in their interpretation. As Father de Smedt points out, S. Augustine had no special sources of information which are not accessible to us, and therefore in the history of this baptismal controversy his authority is no greater than that of more modern writers.⁴

But now,⁵ putting aside Dr. Rivington's arguments, let us consider on its merits the question whether Stephen's harsh reply arrived at Carthage before or after the final baptismal council. The penultimate or second

¹ Cf. *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. iii. cap. 7.

² But even though they may not have seen Stephen's letter, they would know in a general way how strong the feeling at Rome was against rebaptizing, and they would probably have heard of Stephen's excommunication of the Orientals, so that they would quite understand that S. Cyprian was alluding to Stephen in his opening speech.

³ See note 7 on pp. 76, 77.

⁴ See De Smedt, *Dissertationes Selectae*, p. 242, and Aubé, *L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du iii^e siècle*, p. 323, edit. 1886.

⁵ It ought to be mentioned that further on (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 98) Dr. Rivington expresses an opinion, which, if it were true, would favour the view that Stephen's reply arrived in Carthage after the final council. He thinks that, when S. Cyprian sent Stephen's reply to Pompeius of Sabrata, he also sent him the decision of the final council. Dr. Rivington thinks that this result may be deduced from the last paragraph of S. Cyprian's letter to Pompeius (cf. *Ép. lxxiv. ad Pompeium*, § 12, *Opp.*, ed. Hartel, ii. 809). But I cannot for a moment believe that the last paragraph of the letter to Pompeius contains the decision of the council. S. Cyprian must have mentioned the council, if he had been transmitting its decision to one of his suffragans. It seems to me that, as Stephen concluded his reply with a formula which expressed his decision, so Cyprian in the last paragraph of his letter gathered up his teaching into a formula, which in a measure imitates the phraseology of Stephen's formula, while in its substance it expresses the opposite view. It was the teaching of Carthage set over against the teaching of Rome; and it was accepted by Pompeius, who in due time authorized Natalis of Oëa to act for him at the final council, and to cast his vote in favour of rebaptizing.

baptismal council had been held in the spring of 256, and it was from that council that the synodical letter to Stephen was sent. As Stephen had been in correspondence with the Eastern churches on this same question of the baptism of heretics, he must have had at his fingers' ends all the arguments in favour of his own view of the matter. *Prinā facie*, one would suppose that his reply would reach Carthage before midsummer, and that would leave S. Cyprian two months to prepare for the autumn council, which met on September 1. It would be very extraordinary if Stephen delayed his reply for five months, and then sent it so as just to miss the great council of eighty-five bishops, representing the whole of North Africa, which met in September to discuss the question. Moreover, the harshness of Stephen's treatment of the legates of the September council would be easier to explain on the supposition that the council had reaffirmed the African practice in the teeth of Stephen's threat of excommunication. If he had not yet made that threat, the discourtesy of his action would be inexplicable.¹

But to come to the strongest argument of all: S. Cyprian's own words in his opening speech at the September council appear to me to be conclusive against Dr. Rivington's theory. S. Cyprian said, "It remains that we severally declare our opinion on this same subject, judging no one, nor depriving any one of the right of communion, if he differ from us. *For no one of us setteth himself up as a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror forceth his colleagues to a necessity of obeying*; inasmuch as every bishop, according to the absolute independence of his liberty and power, enjoys the right of forming his own judgement, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself judge another."² It seems obvious that S. Cyprian, in these words, is referring to and is repudiating the claim of some unnamed person to set himself up as bishop of bishops, and who sought by tyrannical terror to enforce obedience to himself. And it is equally obvious that it is Stephen whom he has in mind. His words exactly describe Stephen's action; and they prove that that action had already been taken. Baronius,³ Tillemont,⁴ Maran,⁵ and the three Bollandists, Van den Bosche,⁶ Bossue,⁷ and De Smedt,⁸ all agree in this interpretation of S. Cyprian's words. All honour to them for their candour! The President of the Bollandists, Father de Smedt, writes as follows: "Nothing indeed was said [at the September council] about Stephen's letter and his mode of action, but

¹ It is true that Dr. Rivington thinks (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 97) that there was no necessity for Stephen to admit the episcopal legates of the Church of North Africa to a conference, because "they did not come by appointment." It is hardly likely that this view of what would be allowable in accordance with the rules of Christian courtesy will find many defenders. Dr. Rivington, if he had been spared to bring out a new edition of his book, would, I feel sure, have withdrawn this argument.

² See the *proemium* to the *Sententiae Episcoporum*, *Opp.* S. Cypr., ed. Hartel, i. 435, 436.

³ Baron. *Annal.*, s.a. 258, § 42, ed. Antverp., 1617, ii. 521.

⁴ Tillemont, iv. 150.

⁵ Maran., *Vit. S. Cypr.* cap. xxxi., *P. L.*, tom. iv. col. 164.

⁶ *Acta SS.*, tom. i. August., p. 117.

⁷ *Ibid.*, tom. xii. Octobr., p. 480.

⁸ I mention here only Roman Catholic authorities.

nevertheless it is clear enough that they are held up to scorn (*sugillantur*) in Cyprian's opening speech."¹

As may be supposed, there is a general *consensus* of historical experts in favour of the view that Stephen's letter arrived at Carthage before the September council. It is true that Mattes takes Dr. Rivington's view, and that Hefele refrains from expressing a definite opinion; but against Dr. Rivington must be set the names of Cardinal Baronius,² Tillemont,³ Bishop Pearson,⁴ Dom Maran,⁵ Father Suyskens,⁶ Mgr. Freppel,⁷ Archbishop Benson,⁸ Father Bossue,⁹ Mgr. Duchesne,¹⁰ Father de Smedt,¹¹ Professor Jungmann,¹² and M. Aubé.¹³ It will require weightier arguments than Dr. Rivington has used to counterbalance the authority of a phalanx of that strength.

NOTE 29 (see p. 66).—Father de Smedt says, "Augustino schisma Donatistarum impugnant illud maxime cordi erat, ut eis argumentum eriperet quod ex Cypriani, viri tantae apud Afros existimationis et auctoritatis, exemplo desumere potuissent, ideoque in eo totus versabatur ut ostenderet Cyprianum, quamvis cum Stephano circa quaestionem de validitate baptismi haeticorum dissentiret, noluisse tamen se ab ipsis et eorum qui cum ipso sentiebant communione separare."¹⁴

NOTE 30 (see note 4 on p. 67). *On S. Cyprian's share in the translation of S. Firmilian's letter.*—Mr. E. W. Watson, in his admirable essay on the *Style and Language of S. Cyprian*,¹⁵ says, "In *Ep.* lxxv.¹⁶ 'majores natu' is one among many strong evidences against Cyprian as the *original* translator [the italics are mine], as is 'seniores' in the same letter" (ii. 812, 22). But in the same essay Mr. Watson had previously said¹⁷ that S. Cyprian "certainly had a hand in the translation of *Ep.* lxxv., though that can only have been in improving a Latin version already made." All competent critics, whether Anglican, Romanist, or Protestant, appear to be agreed that S. Cyprian had a hand in the Latin translation of S. Firmilian's letter, as it has come down to us. Compare Abp. Benson's *Cyprian*, pp. 381–388.

NOTE 31 (see note 6 on p. 67).—Father de Smedt argues from S.

¹ De Smedt, *Dissert. Select.*, p. 234.

² Baron., *loc. cit.*

³ Tillemont, iv. 153.

⁴ Pearson, *Annales Cypr.*, p. 54.

⁵ Maran. *Vit. S. Cypr.* cap. xxx., *P. L.*, iv. 159.

⁶ *Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Septembr., pp. 299, 300.

⁷ Freppel, *Saint Cyprien*, p. 415.

⁸ Smith and Wace, *D. C. B.*, s.v. *Cyprian*, vol. i. p. 750; and Abp. Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 361.

⁹ *Acta SS.*, tom. xii. Octobr., p. 480.

¹⁰ Duchesne, *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 435.

¹¹ De Smedt, *Dissert. Select.*, p. 234.

¹² Jungmann, *Dissert. Select.*, pp. 329, 330.

¹³ Aubé, *L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du iii^e siècle*, p. 326.

¹⁴ De Smedt, *Dissert. Select.*, pp. 242, 243.

¹⁵ *Studia Biblica*, iv. 260.

¹⁶ *Opp.*, ii. 814, 30.

¹⁷ *Stud. Bibl.*, iv. 197, n. 2.

Cyprian's Epistle to Quintus (*Ep.* lxxi.) that Stephen's controversy with the Orientals preceded his controversy with Cyprian.¹

NOTE 32 (see p. 70). *On the question whether Pope Stephen suffered martyrdom.*—It may be questioned whether Valerian's edict of persecution had been published so early as August 2, 257, which was the date of Stephen's death. That edict forbade under pain of death the holding of "*conciliabula*" and all ingress into the cemeteries or catacombs.² Under those circumstances it is difficult to see how Xystus II. could have been elected and consecrated, if the edict had been published before his election and consecration. More than a year elapsed after the martyrdom of S. Fabian before his successor, S. Cornelius, could be elected. And similarly, very nearly a year elapsed after the martyrdom of S. Xystus before his successor, S. Dionysius, could be appointed.³ Now we know that Valerian's edict had arrived in Carthage by August 30, because on that day S. Cyprian was, in accordance with its provisions, exiled to Curubis.⁴ We cannot therefore put its publication in Rome later than August 25 or 26,⁵ and, on the other hand, we are not obliged to put it earlier. The question arises whether it is possible to suppose that S. Xystus was consecrated before August 25. To that question it seems that an affirmative answer ought to be given. For the *Acta S. Stephani*, published by the Bollandists,⁶ mention that S. Xystus was ordained as Stephen's successor on the ninth of the Kalends of September, that is to say, on August 24. These *Acta* are no doubt late and untrustworthy, but it does not follow that they may not have preserved correctly the date of Xystus' consecration. The different papal lists seem to vary considerably, the one from the other, as to the duration of the episcopate of Xystus, so that no certain date for his consecration is derivable from that source.⁷ This leaves the date supplied by the Bollandist *Acta* in possession; and we may conclude that it is probable that Valerian's edict was not published in Rome until August 25. If that be so, it will follow that Stephen's death, which occurred on August 2, cannot have been brought about by the edict of persecution, and we may well suppose that he died peaceably by a natural death.⁸ In

¹ Cf. De Smedt, *Dissert. Select.*, p. 226. Perhaps the two controversies went on more or less *pari passu*; but there can be no doubt that Stephen's excommunication of the Orientals preceded his excommunication of the Africans. See p. 463.

² See the *Acta Proconsularia* of the martyrdom of S. Cyprian, § I (*Opp.*, ed. Hartel, Append. p. cxi.).

³ The Church of Rome was a very large body, and for the election of a bishop it was necessary that a full meeting should be held, not only of the clergy, but also of the laity. Such a meeting would be almost impossible when the cemeteries were closed, and meetings were forbidden under pain of death.

⁴ See the *Acta Proconsularia*, *ut supra*.

⁵ Archbishop Benson (*Cyprian*, p. xxv.) says, "A sailing vessel running before a fair wind from Ostia could reach Carthage on the second day."

⁶ *Acta SS.*, tom. i. August., p. 144.

⁷ See Bishop Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. i. pp. 285, 290, edit. 1890.

⁸ Compare Aubé, *op. cit.*, pp. 331-334, 365, 366. Archbishop Benson thinks that the edict was published in Rome before August 2, but he nevertheless holds that Stephen was not martyred, but died a natural death in Rome (see *Alp. Benson's Cyprian*, p. 475). The archbishop does not seem to notice the difficulty of supposing that the edict was published before the election of Xystus.

the Philocalian collection of 354 the name of Stephen occurs in the *Depos. Episcoporum*, and not in the *Depos. Martirum*; whereas the name of Xystus appears in the latter.¹

NOTE 33 (see p. 71). *S. Cyprian never retracted.*—In regard to a supposed retraction of Cyprian before his death, Father de Smedt drily observes, “Cyprianum ante mortem errorem suum retractasse, magis pie quam probabiliter assereretur.”² Mgr. Duchesne, writing about the reunion of Rome with Carthage and Caesarea in the time of S. Xystus, points out that it was Rome that gave way, and not Cyprian or Firmilian. He says, “L’union ne se rétablit pas aux dépens de l’usage de Saint Cyprien et de Saint Firmilien; Saint Basile au iv^e siècle appliquait la même discipline que son célèbre prédécesseur. Elle était encore en vigueur dans les églises africaines au temps du concile d’Arles (314).”³

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON APPENDIX A.

NOTE 34 (see p. 73). *In S. Cyprian’s time the African custom of re-baptizing prevailed in the larger part of the Church.*—I have ventured to say in the text that it is probable that Stephen excommunicated a majority of all the Catholic churches then in existence. On the other hand, in Dr. Rivington’s book, *Authority*, may be read the following passage: “It is notorious that Stephen did not stand alone. S. Augustine says that S. Cyprian’s party consisted of ‘some fifty Orientals, and seventy or a few more Africans, against many hundreds of bishops, to whom this error was displeasing, throughout the whole world.’”⁴ The trustful reader who, without verification, is willing to accept as S. Augustine’s the words which Dr. Rivington professes to quote from that Father, would naturally suppose that S. Augustine meant that hundreds of *contemporary* bishops sided with Stephen against Cyprian. But such an impression would be wholly erroneous, and would be due to the very curious method of translation which Dr. Rivington has in this case adopted. S. Augustine’s words are, “Contra tot *millia* episcoporum, quibus hic error in toto orbe displicuit.”⁵ It is obviously most misleading to translate “tot *millia*,” “many *hundreds*.” Why not go a little further and translate “tot *millia*,” “many *decades*,” or “many *units*”? As it is certain that in the third century the Catholic episcopate did not number “many thousands of bishops,” S. Augustine is clearly speaking, not of Cyprian’s contemporaries, but of all the generations of bishops who had held office in the Church during the century and a half which intervened between Cyprian’s age and his own. Even when we have made this correction, it will still remain the fact that S. Augustine was misinformed in regard

¹ See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 249, 251.

² *Dissert. Select.*, p. 234.

³ *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 439.

⁴ *Authority*, p. 105, 2nd edit.

⁵ S. Augustin., *Contra Cresconium Donatistam*, lib. iii. cap. iii., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. ix. col. 437.

to the view which the Easterns¹ took of this question.² The great majority of the Eastern churches from the time of S. Cyprian until this nineteenth century have denied in principle the validity of heretical baptism, though in the case of some particular heresies they have been prepared to dispense with re-baptization, and to admit converts from those heresies by confirmation. The historical proof of this fact has been often set forth, and the reader may be specially referred to the treatise on the *Minister of Baptism*, by the Rev. W. Elwin. If we consider the state of things which existed at the time when the baptismal controversy first broke out, we shall find that the bishops of Italy, Egypt, and perhaps Palestine,³ were on the side of Stephen; and to these must probably be added the few bishops in Spain, Gaul, and perhaps Greece; while on the side of Cyprian must be reckoned the bishops of Africa, Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, and the further East.⁴ I should suppose that there can be no doubt that the number of bishops who sided with Cyprian was considerably larger than the number of those who sided with Stephen; and, if we take into consideration the fact that, as Duchesne says, "Christians were incomparably more numerous in the East than in the West,"⁵ it will be seen that Stephen had entered on a course which would have ended in an attempt to excommunicate the larger part of the Catholic Church. When S. Augustine speaks of "fifty

¹ Archbishop Benson (*Cyprian*, p. 379) says, "No one doubts Eusebius's ignorance of the West, or Augustine's of the East."

² There can be no doubt that S. Augustine imagined that Stephen was supported by a majority of the episcopate. Cf. S. Aug., *De Unic. Bapt. contr. Petil.* cap. xiv., *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ix. 538. But, as Fr. De Smedt says very truly, "In hac re ejus [sc. Augustini] auctoritas non est major quam scriptoris recentioris" (*Dissert. Select.*, p. 242).

³ Duchesne (*Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 433) says, "Sur ce point, comme sur beaucoup d'autres, la Palestine paraît avoir suivi l'usage d'Alexandrie. Je le conclus de la manière dont Eusèbe (*H.E.*, vii. 2) parle de la coutume romaine." But for a passage which looks the other way, see S. Cyrill. Hierosol. *Procatech.*, cap. vii.

⁴ Duchesne (*loc. cit.*), after having mentioned that the African rule about re-baptizing heretics was in force in Asia Minor, goes on to say, "Elle était également observée à Antioche et en Syrie." No doubt the use of Antioch prevailed in Cilicia, Mesopotamia, and the East, which were all in a measure subordinate to Antioch. Compare Duchesne (*Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 337, n. 1). One must note that S. Denys the Great, in a letter to the Roman priest, Philemon (ap. Euseb. *H.E.*, vii. 7), says that the Cyprianic opinion was adopted "long ago in the most populous churches."

⁵ Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 21. As regards the comparative number of bishops who sided respectively with Stephen and with Cyprian, it may be observed that, according to Bingham (*Antiquities*, book ix. chap. v. § 1, *Works*, edit. 1843, vol. iii. p. 126) there were about 300 bishoprics in the seventeen provinces of Italy; whereas it is computed that in Africa there were no less than 470 (Cf. *P. L.*, tom. xi. col. 834). It will be understood that these figures represent the numbers, not in the third century, but in the fifth century or later. But the proportion was probably much the same in the third century. In the summer or autumn of 251 S. Cornelius assembled sixty bishops in synod, who must have been mainly Italians; whereas a few years before, in the time of Cyprian's predecessor, Donatus, ninety African bishops had deposed Privatus of Lambesis. Similarly, Dr. Neale (*General Introduction*, vol. i. pp. 115, 116) gives a list of 104 bishoprics subject to Alexandria, but he says (p. 126) that "in the time of its glory, Antioch seems to have had about 250 suffragan sees," and the numbers in Asia Minor were very large.

Oriental," he is either mistaken or he may be referring, as De Valois¹ supposes, to the numbers who were present at the Council of Iconium, twenty-five years before Stephen began the quarrel.

NOTE 35 (see note 1 on p. 75). *On the meaning of a certain phrase in Eusebius' History.*—After reading Dr. Rivington's note (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 81), in which he discusses the meaning of the words, *ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων*, words which occur in a passage quoted by Eusebius² from a letter addressed by S. Denys to S. Xystus of Rome, in which S. Denys is summarizing a letter written by Stephen, I wrote to Professor Jebb of Cambridge, asking him to be so kind as to give me his opinion as to the meaning of the Greek expression. In his reply Sir Richard Jebb says, "The words of Stephen, as quoted by Dionysius, would naturally mean that, from the time at which he was writing, he would refuse to communicate with the bishops in question. The ground of this resolve is described as existent, not as contingent: *ἐπειδὴ . . . ἀναβαπτίζουσι*. Of course the Greek words do not actually exclude some qualifying, but unexpressed, thought, such as, 'he would (ultimately) cease to communicate with them,' if they persisted in re-baptizing. But this is not the natural or obvious meaning. If we said in English, 'he declared that he would not communicate with them, since they re-baptized heretics,' the plain sense would be that he intended to take such a course *thenceforth*. The case is precisely the same with the Greek words here. (It may be noted in passing that the use of the future participle by Dionysius, or Stephen, is not in accordance with pure classical Greek idiom, though it was very common in days when the Latin use of the future participle had infected Greek usage. A Greek writer of the fifth or fourth century B.C., would have said, not *κοινωνήσων*, but *μέλλων κοινωνήσσειν*, or *κοινωνεῖν βουλόμενος*, or the like.)" In a second letter Dr. Jebb writes, "You are quite at liberty to quote my letter, provided you make it clear that I was dealing with the verbal question only, and not expressing any opinion concerning the historical facts to which Dionysius refers. I am not competent to form any judgment as to what Stephen actually did; and I should not wish to appear as taking any side in the controversy on that question. But as to the *natural* meaning of the words which you quote, I have no doubt at all."

I am very grateful to Sir Richard Jebb for answering my question so fully, and for allowing me to make his answer public; and I naturally rejoice to find that my own interpretation, which is also that of Baronius and Mansi, is supported by the judgement of so distinguished a scholar.

NOTE 36 (see note 2 on p. 75).—I have said in the text that S. Denys of Alexandria in that fragment of a letter of his to S. Xystus II. of Rome, which is quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.*, vii. 5), "dealt entirely with Stephen's relations with the Eastern bishops, and said nothing of his relations with the Church of North Africa." This statement is literally true; but

¹ See a note of De Valois' on Euseb. *H. E.*, vii. 5, and compare Abp. Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 340.

² *H. E.*, vii. 5.

nevertheless the word οὐδέ in the expression—ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων implies that in a previous passage of this letter S. Denys had been referring to other persons with whom Stephen had refused to communicate, because they re-baptized heretics; and there can be no doubt that in that previous passage, which Eusebius does not quote, S. Denys had been speaking of Stephen's rupture of relations with S. Cyprian and the African bishops. It is important to notice that S. Denys by his use of the word πρότερον (previously) implies that the excommunication of the Easterns preceded the excommunication of the Africans.

NOTE 37 (see note 2 on p. 77).—Maran's principal argument in favour of his view that the African legates, who were rejected by Stephen, were sent by the second council on baptism and not by the third, depends on his theory that, if the legates had been sent by the third council, which was opened on the first of September, there would not have been time for S. Cyprian's deacon, Rogatianus, to carry his letter to S. Firmilian in Cappadocia and to return to Carthage before winter had set in. Archbishop Benson, who accepts Maran's view that the legates were sent by the second council, makes it clear that he does not attribute force to Maran's argument from the lateness of the season, when the third council met. He says (*Cyprian*, p. 373, n. 1), "Supposing the delegates to have left Carthage about the end of the first week of September, there were eight weeks for them to go to Rome, to return to Carthage, then for Rogatian to make his way to Caesarea and be back in Carthage 'before winter,' which, for navigation purposes, began at this era about November 3. This would be time enough."¹ It does not seem to me to be certain that Rogatianus must necessarily have got back to Carthage before November 3. Aubé (*L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du iii^e siècle*, edit. 1886, p. 329) thinks it sufficient to say, "Ce fut seulement à la fin de l'année 256 que la réponse de Firmilien arriva à Carthage." Dr. Rivington agrees (*Prim. Ch.*, ch. viii.) that the legation to Rome, which was repulsed by Stephen, was subsequent to the third council. The mission of Rogatianus to Caesarea was unquestionably posterior to the repulse of the legation.

NOTE 38 (see note 3 on p. 77).—Father De Smedt discusses the question "Utrum Stephanus in Cyprianum et Firmilianum excommunicationis sententiam tulerit?"² He decides that we must come to the same conclusion as in the case of the controversy between Victor and the Asians.³ In that case after a full discussion of the various aspects of the matter, he had concluded that Victor had deprived the Asians of his communion.⁴ Hence it follows that De Smedt holds that Stephen deprived Cyprian and Firmilian of his communion.

¹ Compare also Abp. Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 380.

² *Dissert. Select.*, pp. 238-244.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 242.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON APPENDIX B.

NOTE 39 (see note 2 on p. 81).—That S. Cyprian regarded the Catholic Church as “the root and mother” of the separate local churches can be shown demonstratively by a passage in his treatise *Ad Fortunatum (de exhortatione martyrii)*, where, having dwelt on the mystical number of the seven martyred Maccabees, and having pointed out that the number corresponds with that of the seven churches and their angels, to whom the Lord sent His commands and instructions in the Apocalypse, he goes on to say, “With the seven children there is evidently conjoined also the mother, their origin and root, who subsequently bare the seven churches, she herself having been founded first and alone by the voice of the Lord upon Peter.”¹ Obviously it was not the local Roman Church but the Church universal, who bare in her womb the seven churches of Asia, and who, as S. Cyprian implies, was their “origo et radix.”

NOTE 40 (see note 3 on p. 81).—S. Cyprian says that the Novatian party at Rome had “refused the bosom and embrace of their root and mother.” So at the third Council of Carthage on the baptism of heretics Felix of Uthina (26) speaks of “omnes haeretici qui ad sinum matris ecclesiae adcurrunt.”² Manifestly Felix is speaking of the bosom of the Catholic Church, not of the local Roman Church. The expression occurs in a speech, in which he is opposing the teaching and practice of the Roman Church. And who can doubt that the same interpretation must be given to the exactly parallel expression used by S. Cyprian in his letter to S. Cornelius?³ Evidently Mgr. Duchesne takes that view, for he quotes and glosses the passage thus, “Non tantum . . . matris [Ecclesiae] sinum adque complexum recusavit.”⁴

NOTE 41 (see note 1 on p. 83). *Bossuet's interpretation of the Cyprianic expression, “matrix et radix.”*—Bossuet, when he is interpreting S. Cyprian, understands the “matrix et radix,” as I do, of the Church's unity.⁵

¹ “Cum septem liberis plane copulatur et mater origo et radix, quae ecclesias septem postmodum peperit, ipsa prima et una super Petrum Domini voce fundata” (*Ad Fortunatum*, cap. xi., *P. L.*, iv. 694, 695). I have followed in this quotation Baluze's reading, *Petrum*, and not Hartel's reading, *petram*. On the true reading in this passage, see Mr. E. W. Watson's remarks (*Studia Biblica*, tom. iv. p. 256).

² *Opp.* S. Cypri., ed. Hartel, i. 446.

³ Cf. *Ep.* xlv. *ad Cornelium*, § 1, *Opp.*, ii. 600.

⁴ Duchesne, *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 420, n. Dr. Rivington's gloss (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 464) on the passage is very different. After quoting S. Cyprian's expression, “the bosom and embrace of the root and mother,” he appends, as an explanation, the words—“the legitimate bishop,” adding, “For the legitimate bishop is the root of the Church in each region.” To which gloss one might reply by the question, Is the legitimate bishop also the *mother* of the Church in each region? For it is obvious that a true gloss must suit “mater” as well as “radix.”

⁵ *Instruction Pastorale sur les Promesses de l'Église* (*Oeuvres*, edit. 1816, xxii. 411, 412).

He nowhere suggests that S. Cyprian means by the "*matrix et radix*" the local Church of Rome or the see of Rome. When he speaks of "cette tige, cette racine de l'unité," he is referring chiefly to the unity which binds into one all the successive generations of the Church through the tradition of the one faith and through the succession of the apostolic ministry, though he refers also to the unity which knits together the various churches existing in different places at any one epoch. I have no objection to describe one aspect of Bossuet's view of S. Cyprian's meaning in the words of Dr. Rivington, when he says that the "root" "is the Church putting herself forth in a long chain of teachers."¹ I do not see that anywhere in his discussion of S. Cyprian's teaching does Bossuet attribute to that Father the view that this operation must be carried out "within the unity of the Chair of Peter." No doubt that was Bossuet's own theory, but he does not, so far as I am aware, impute it in his Pastoral Instruction to S. Cyprian. It is really too bad of Dr. Rivington to say that "then Bossuet proceeds to explain this root of unity more fully," whereupon he quotes a passage from Bossuet's *Instruction Pastorale*, eleven pages further on,² in which the Bishop of Meaux gives his own personal views,³ of the relation of the papacy to ecclesiastical unity, saying nothing about S. Cyprian or about the expression "*radix et matrix*." In the course of those intervening eleven pages Bossuet had discussed the opinions of Tertullian, S. Clement of Alexandria, and S. Bernard, and also other matters; so that the later passage is in no sort of way an explanation of the Cyprianic phrase.

NOTE 42 (see note 2 on p. 83).—Dr. Rivington thinks that "no one would talk of *acknowledging* the Catholic Church."⁴ But surely, when speaking of a place, where there were rival bodies, it would be most natural to tell people intending to travel, that they ought to make inquiries, and to be careful to acknowledge and hold fast to that body which enjoyed, or clearly had a right to enjoy, the communion of the Catholic episcopate. By acting in this way the travellers would, as far as in them lay, acknowledge and hold fast to her who was the root and womb of their regenerate life. Dr. Rivington also thinks that it is "the bishop, who is the root and womb of the Church."⁵ I find it hard to believe that any instance can be found of a bishop being called "the womb of the Church." It is a very strange way of describing him. But it is not at all strange to speak of the Catholic Church as the root and womb of her children.⁶ Apparently Dr. Rivington thinks that S. Cyprian is speaking only of the instructions which he gave to people sailing "to Rome."⁷ But there is nothing in S. Cyprian's forty-eighth letter to suggest this limitation, although no doubt a large number of those, who sailed from Africa, would

¹ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 466.

² *Œuvres*, xxii. 423, 424.

³ Bossuet illustrates his view by quoting a passage from S. Optatus of Mileum,

⁴ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 465.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

⁶ S. Cyprian uses the word "*matrix*" to denote the Catholic Church in his *Ep. lxxi. ad Quintum*, § 2 (*Opp.*, ii. 772), and also in his treatise, *De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate*, § 23 (*Opp.*, i. 231).

⁷ *Prim. Ch.*, *u.s.*

be on their way to Rome. S. Cyprian's advice was so worded that it would be applicable in any place where schismatic bodies were established alongside of the Catholic Church, even though there might happen to be a vacancy in the Catholic see.

NOTE 43 (see note 3 on p. 83). *S. Cyprian's use of the genitive of apposition.*—One may compare the parallel expression, “*radicem adque originem traditionis dominicæ*” in *Ep. lxxiii. ad Caecilium*, § 1.¹ It is clear from § 2 that the *traditio dominica* is equivalent to “quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecit,” and the expression “*traditionis dominicæ*” is in the genitive of apposition. Similarly in *Ep. lxxiv. ad Pompeium*, § 10,² S. Cyprian says, “*Si ad divinæ traditionis caput et originem revertamur.*” A comparison of § 10 with § 11 seems to show that the expression “*divinæ traditionis*” is also in the genitive of apposition. But in fact this use of the genitive case is very common in S. Cyprian's writings.

NOTE 44 (see note 2 on p. 84). *On the meaning of the word “caput” in certain Cyprianic passages.*—“We who hold the fountain-head (*caput*) and root.”³ It is clear to me that the word “*caput*,” as used by S. Cyprian in this passage and in some other parallel passages, ought to be translated “fountain-head” or “source.” Readers of Horace will remember the line in the first ode of the first book, in which occur the words, “*Nunc ad aquæ lenæ caput sacrae.*” And there is a sentence in S. Cyprian's letter to Pompeius,⁴ in which there can be no question that “*caput*” means “fountain-head.” S. Cyprian says, “*ut si canalis aquam ducens . . . subito deficiat, nonne ad fontem pergitur, ut illic defectionis ratio noscatur, utrumne arescentibus venis in capite unda siccaverit,*”⁵ etc. But this metaphor of a man seeking at the fountain-head the reason for the failure of the water is brought in by S. Cyprian to explain what he had been saying in the previous clause of the same sentence, in which the following words occur:—“*Si ad divinæ traditionis caput et originem revertamur, cessat error humanus.*”⁶ It is obvious that “*caput*” here has the same meaning of “fountain-head” or “source,” and one sees at once how natural it is to couple “*caput*” in that sense with “*origo.*” But this same combination of “*caput*” with “*origo*” occurs in S. Cyprian's treatise *De Zelo et Livore*,⁷ and also in his better-known treatise, *De Cath. Eccl. Unit.*,⁸ where the Church is called “the fountain-head and source of truth” (*veritatis caput adque originem*). Similarly the same combination occurs in two earlier passages of the treatise on *Unity*; first of all in § 3,⁹ where S. Cyprian says that men, deceived by Satan, leave the

¹ *Opp.*, ii. 701.

² *Ibid.*, ii. 808.

³ S. Cyp. *Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaianum*, § 2, *Opp.*, ii. 779.

⁴ *Ep. lxxiv.* § 10, *Opp.*, ii. 808.

⁵ “As if a conduit conveying water . . . should suddenly fail, do we not go to the fountain, that there the reason of the failure may be ascertained, whether, the springs having run dry, the water has dried up at the fountain-head?”

⁶ “If we return to the fountain-head and source of divine tradition, human error ceases.”

⁷ § 3, *Opp.*, i. 421.

⁸ § 12, *Opp.*, i. 220.

⁹ *Opp.*, i. 212.

Church and join the sects, "when they do not have recourse to the source of truth (*ad veritatis originem*), and do not seek the fountain-head (*nec caput quaeritur*),¹ and do not guard the doctrine of the heavenly teaching" (*magisterii caelestis*); and secondly, in § 5, where, contrasting the unity of the whole Church with the multiplicity of her children, he says that the Church "pours abroad her streams which flow forth abundantly, yet that there is one fountain-head and one source and one mother having an abundance of children, the issue of her fruitfulness" (*unum tamen caput est et origo una et una mater fecunditatis successibus copiosa*).² Here "caput" and "origo" are joined with "mater," and that conjunction would suggest that we might find instances of the combination of either of these words or both of them, with "matrix" or with "radix."³ As a matter of fact we find in *Ad Fortunatum*⁴ "*origo et radix*," in *Ad Demetrianum*⁵ "*radicis adque originis*," in the letter to Caecilius⁶ "*radicem adque originem*," and finally in the letter to Jubaianus,⁷ "*caput et radicem*;" and this last is the passage which gave rise to this discussion. It appears, therefore, that "caput" is used in this passage in the sense of "fountain-head" or "source."⁸

NOTE 45 (see note 4 on p. 84).—Although Jubaianus, no less than Cyprian and his fellow-bishops of Africa and Numidia, was in communion with the one Catholic Church, yet Dr. Rivington is mistaken in his idea⁹ that Jubaianus is included in the "nos."¹⁰ He had not as yet joined Cyprian and his adherents in drawing the conclusion that the baptism administered by Novatian was invalid. All through this early part of the letter "nos" is contrasted with "tu."

NOTE 46 (see note 5 on pp. 84, 85). *A celebrated Cyprianic passage guarded from misinterpretation.*—It seems almost incredible, but it is the

¹ It is plain that Dr. Rivington is mistaken, when, commenting on the words, "*nec caput quaeritur*," he says (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 61), "The head is the bishop viewed as the heir of the promises made to Peter." In an earlier passage of his book (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 49), Dr. Rivington had given a completely different interpretation of the words "*nec caput quaeritur*," an interpretation which in its substance is not far from the truth, though it is based on a wrong view of the meaning of "caput."

² *Opp.*, i. 214.

³ "Radix" is joined with "mater" in *Ep.* xlv. *ad Cornelium*, § 1, *Opp.*, ii. 600, and with "matrix" in *Ep.* xlviii. *ad Cornelium*, § 3, *Opp.*, ii. 607.

⁴ § 11, *Opp.*, i. 338.

⁵ § 2, *Opp.*, i. 352.

⁶ *Ep.* lxxiii. *ad Caecilium*, § 1, *Opp.*, ii. 701.

⁷ *Ep.* lxxiii. *ad Jubaianum*, § 2, *Opp.*, ii. 779.

⁸ Dr. Rivington tries (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 464) to bolster up his theory that in this passage the "caput et radix" of the Church is Pope Stephen, by quoting S. Cyprian's words to the effect that the party of Novatian had set up "an adulterous and opposed head outside the Church" (see *Ep.* xlv. *ad Cornelium*, § 1, *Opp.*, ii. 600). But in that letter to Cornelius, written five years earlier, the word "caput" is used in the sense of "head" or bishop of the local Church of Rome. The schismatics had made Novatian the pseudo-bishop of Rome. Whereas here S. Cyprian is speaking of the Catholic Church as the fountain-head and root of individual Christians. The word "caput" is used in a totally different sense, so that the two passages have no bearing, the one on the other.

⁹ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 85, n. 2.

¹⁰ "*Nos autem qui ecclesiae unius caput et radicem tenemus*" (*Ep.* lxxiii. § 2).

fact that Dr. Rivington, commenting on the words in S. Cyprian's treatise *on the Unity of the Church*, "unum tamen caput est et origo una et una mater fecunditatis successibus copiosa,"¹ glosses them as follows:—"meaning the Church and Peter, whom Christ instituted as the 'origin of unity.'" He goes on to say that in that passage S. Cyprian "sees in the legitimate bishop the Peter for the time being."² Those who are familiar with the paragraph in question will remember that S. Peter is not mentioned in it; nor is a word said about "the legitimate bishop" being "the Peter for the time being." The statements in Dr. Rivington's gloss are pure romance. The passage, which gave rise to this astounding comment, together with the sentences which immediately precede it, grows out of and is intended to illustrate the following statement: "The Church is one, and she is spread abroad far and wide, so as to become a multitude, through the increase of her fruitfulness." S. Cyprian follows up this statement by a series of analogies taken from nature, which emphasize the contrast between the unity of the Church and the multiplicity of her progeny. The Church is compared to the one sun, and to the one tree, and to the one spring, and to the one mother; while we, her children, are compared to the many rays, and to the many branches, and to the many streams, and to the many descendants. But it will be best to give the passage in full. It runs thus: "As there are many rays of the sun, yet but one light; and as there are many branches of the tree, yet but one oak secured by its tenacious root; and as when from one spring there flow down many streams, although multiplicity seems to be diffused through the bountifulness of the overflowing abundance, nevertheless unity is preserved in the source (in origine). Separate a ray of the sun from its body [of light], the unity of the light suffers no division; break a branch from the tree, the broken branch will not be able to bud; cut off a stream from the spring, the stream so cut off dries up. So also the Church, flooded with the light of the Lord, puts forth her rays all over the whole world; nevertheless it is one light which is everywhere diffused, nor does the unity of the body suffer division. So she [the Church] stretches out her branches over the whole earth by the abundance of her productiveness; she extends far and wide her streams issuing forth in copious outflow: nevertheless there is one fountain-head (caput) and one source (origo) and one mother prolific in children, the issue of her fruitfulness. By her bringing forth we are born, by her milk we are nourished, by her life we are quickened."³ It will be seen that there is no reference here to the "legitimate bishop" as being "the Peter for the time being," nor to "Peter whom Christ instituted as 'the origin of unity.'" The passage is entirely taken up with the relation of the Church as a whole in her unity⁴ to the children of the

¹ S. Cypr. *de Cath. Eccl. Unit.*, § 5, *Opp.*, i. 214.

² *Prim. Ch.*, p. 464.

³ S. Cypr., *loc. cit.*

⁴ So Dom Maran, in the preface to the Benedictine S. Cyprian (p. vii.), speaking of the passage of the *De Unitate*, quoted in the text, rightly says, "non ecclesiae particularis, sed universalis sive catholicae unitas describitur;" and again a little lower down Dom Maran, speaking of that same passage, says, "Sanctus martyr unum toto orbe episcopatum commendat."

Church in their multiplicity. Peter, in S. Cyprian's view, was the first-called Apostle,¹ and so for a transient moment the Church's unity was embodied in him, and thus he was the historical commencement of that unity.² In that sense he was the "origo unitatis;" and S. Cyprian dwells on the fact in the preceding section of this treatise.³ But here he is dealing, not with the historical commencement (origo) of the Church's unity, but with the Church in her unity as the perennial source (origo) of her children in their multiplicity.

NOTE 47 (see note I on p. 85).—Dr. Rivington, commenting on my words—"S. Cyprian was opposing Pope Stephen,"⁴ says, "This is an anachronism. Stephen had not yet appeared on the scene."⁵ That, however, is not the view taken by the learned President of the Bollandists. He agrees with Archbishop Tizzani that even in S. Cyprian's epistle to Quintus, an epistle which was written some time before the epistle to Jubaianus, "it seems clear enough that Cyprian treats with scorn (sugillare) the decision on the subject of the baptism of heretics, which had been published by Stephen."⁶ It is true, no doubt, that Stephen's decision in the African controversy was sent to Carthage after the letter to Jubaianus had been written; but, as Father De Smedt points out, the decision, which was treated with scorn in the letter to Quintus, would be the decision promulgated by Stephen in the controversy about re-baptism, which he had been carrying on with the Easterns.⁷ Stephen had in that controversy already declared his view about re-baptism, and had tried to enforce that view by excommunicating the Oriental bishops, who refused to conform to it. So that it is not correct to say that, when the letter to Jubaianus was written, "Stephen had not yet appeared on the scene." Moreover it seems pretty clear, as De Smedt also points out, that in the concluding paragraphs of the letter to Jubaianus Cyprian "is carping at Stephen."⁸

NOTE 48 (see note I on p. 88).—It is true that in the greater part of his treatise, *De Unitate*, S. Cyprian is dealing rather with the unity of each local church than with the unity of the whole Catholic Church.⁹ Nevertheless

¹ But see the note on p. 88.

² Similarly S. Cyprian speaks (*De Bono Patientiae*, § 10, *Opp.*, i. 403) of Abel as initiating the "originem martyrii," because, historically, he was the first martyr.

³ *De Cath. Eccl. Unit.*, § 4, *Opp.*, i. 213.

⁴ I was speaking of the earlier part of the year 256, when S. Cyprian's letter to Jubaianus was written.

⁵ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 85, n. 2.

⁶ De Smedt, *Dissert. Sel.*, p. 226. Compare also Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*, pp. 346, 350.

⁷ Or, if not the final decision, then one of the earlier letters of the controversy.

⁸ *Dissert. Sel.*, p. 233.

⁹ If Dr. Rivington is speaking of the larger portion of S. Cyprian's treatise and not of the whole of it, he is right in saying (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 57), that the circumstances under which he wrote it "would not necessarily, nor even naturally, lead him to the subject of papal jurisdiction;" for, as Dr. Rivington truly observes, "It was the rights of bishops over the laity, and the test of a lawful occupant of any see, Rome included, which occupied his [Cyprian's] attention." It is for that very reason that Dr. Rivington must be held to misrepresent S. Cyprian's teaching, when (*Prim. Ch.*, pp. 61, 62) he credits the holy martyr with the doctrine

there is one most important passage, contained in the fourth and fifth paragraphs, in which the holy martyr treats of the unity of the Church Universal, of "the one and undivided episcopate," and of the one Church putting forth her rays "all over the whole world." In that passage he quotes the great Petrine text about "the rock" and "the keys," but he interprets it of Peter as the historical commencement of the episcopate, not of Peter and his local successors at Rome as the perennial fountain of a unity secured by their supreme jurisdiction and by their being the necessary centre of communion. If S. Cyprian had believed in the modern papal claims, he must have mentioned them in that passage.

NOTE 49 (see note 2 on p. 88). *S. Cyprian and S. Augustine taught that S. Peter symbolized the Church's unity.*—Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 61) says, "Mr. Puller does not venture to translate the word 'manifest' by 'symbolize,' but throughout he appears to understand them as equivalent." I certainly do think that, when S. Cyprian in his *De Unitate* (§ 4, *Opp.*, i. 212, 213) says that our Lord arranged for His Church to start from one man, namely S. Peter, "ut unitatem manifestaret," or again "ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur," he means that Christ made this arrangement in order that the unity of the Church might be symbolized or typified or figured by S. Peter. The same thought occurs in S. Cyprian's Epistle to Jubaianus, where he says, "To Peter, in the first place, upon whom he built the Church, and from whom he appointed and *showed forth* the origin of unity (et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit), the Lord gave that power, namely, that whatsoever he should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven."¹ And it is to be noted that S. Augustine, when quoting this passage, substitutes the words "in *typo* unitatis" for the words "unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit."² S. Augustine rightly sees that, when in this group of passages S. Cyprian uses such words as "ostendere," "manifestare," "monstrare," he means to imply that S. Peter was appointed to be the *type* or *symbol* or *figure* of the Church's unity. And S. Augustine not only rightly understood S. Cyprian's meaning,³ but he also, as might

that the rent garment of Ahijah, which fitly symbolized the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah, could not symbolize the Church militant here on earth, because that Church in its entirety is always visibly one. That is not the teaching of S. Cyprian. He held, indeed, as we also hold, that there is a most real unity of the Catholic Church, resulting primarily from her union with our Lord, which is incapable of division; but, when he applies the contrast between Ahijah's garment and Christ's seamless robe to the visible state of the Church on earth, he applies it to the visible unity of each local Church, not to the visible unity of the whole Church militant. When making this application he says (*De Unitate*, § 8, *Opp.*, i. 216), "Who then is such a criminal and traitor, who is so inflamed by the madness of discord, as to think aught can rend, or to venture on rending, the unity of God, the garment of the Lord, the Church of Christ? He Himself warns us in His gospel and teaches, saying, 'And there shall be one flock and one shepherd.' And does any one think that there can *in one place* be either many shepherds or many flocks?" Thus S. Cyprian's application of the type is not to the Church Universal, but to the Church "*in one place.*"

¹ S. Cypr. *Ep.* lxxiii. ad Jubaianum, § 7, *Opp.*, ii. 783.

² Cf. S. August., *De Baptismo*, lib. iii. cap. xvii., *P. L.*, xliii. 149.

³ In an article entitled *L'idée de l'Église dans saint Cyprien*, which was published in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* for November, 1896, the learned author, who writes under the *nom de plume* of J. Delarochelle, and

be expected, agreed with his teaching. So in his *Enarratio* on the 108th (Heb. 109th) Psalm, he says, "For as some things are said which seem peculiarly to apply to the Apostle Peter, and yet are not clear in their meaning, unless when referred to the Church, whom he is admitted to have represented *in a figure* (cujus ille agnoscitur *in figura* gestasse personam), on account of the pre-eminence which he enjoyed among the disciples (propter primatum quem in discipulis habuit); as it is written, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' and other passages of the like purport: so Judas doth in a certain way represent those Jews who were enemies of Christ."¹ And again in his fiftieth Homily on S. John's Gospel S. Augustine says, "Peter, when he received the keys, *symbolized the holy Church*"² (*Ecclesiam sanctam significavit*). Once more, in his 149th Sermon, S. Augustine says, "Since *in symbolic meaning* (*in significatione*) Peter was representing the Church, what was given to him alone, was given to the Church. Therefore Peter was bearing *the figure* of the Church"³ (*figuram gestabat Ecclesiae*).

NOTE 50 (see note 2 on p. 90).—In illustration of what is said in the text, the speech made at the third Carthaginian Council on baptism by Fortunatus of Thuccaboris may be consulted.⁴ He refers to the Church being founded on Peter, in order that he may conclude from that premiss that the power of baptizing has been committed to the bishops.⁵ It must be remembered that this council was held at a moment when the ecclesiastical relations of Rome and Africa were very strained, and when in fact the pope was preparing to separate the African bishops from his communion.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LECTURE III.

NOTE 51 (see p. 96). *In primitive times, not only the Roman popes but also other bishops used to write admonitory letters to foreign churches.*—It will perhaps help us to understand how natural it was for

who is evidently a sincere papalist, thus sums up (p. 528) S. Cyprian's view: "Ainsi la primauté de Pierre était un symbole. Il a reçu avant tous les autres le pouvoir apostolique pour qu'il figurât dans l'unité de sa personne l'unité de l'Église. Puis le même pouvoir a été donné à tous les apôtres, qui le détiennent solidairement avec lui, et au même titre, au même degré." That is exactly S. Cyprian's view; and it is pleasant to find it honestly acknowledged by one who, as an Ultramontane, takes a very different view. The Cyprianic view has been widely propagated in the later English Church by means of Bishop Pearson's great work on the Creed. Pearson says (Art. ix. n. 69, ed. Burton, Oxford, 1870, p. 600), "Whereas all the rest of the Apostles had equal power and honour with S. Peter, yet Christ did particularly give that power to S. Peter, to show the unity of the Church which he intended to build upon the foundation of the Apostles."

¹ S. August. *Enarrat. in Psalm. cviii.* § 1, *P. L.*, xxxvii. 1431, 1432.

² S. August. *in Joannis Evang. tractat.* l. § 12, *P. L.*, xxxv. 1763.

³ S. August. *Serm. cxlix. cap. vi.*, *P. L.*, xxxviii. 802.

⁴ *Sententiae episcoporum*, n. 17, *Opp.*, i. 444.

⁵ See also a passage in the Epistle of S. Firmilian (*Ep. S. Firmil., inter Cyprianicas* lxxv. § 16, *Opp.* S. Cypr., ii. 820, 821).

S. Clement and the Church of Rome to write a letter of admonition to the Church of Corinth, if we recall to mind what Eusebius¹ tells us of the various Catholic epistles which S. Dionysius of Corinth (*circa* 170) wrote to different churches in foreign parts. Thus he wrote to the Lacedaemonians a letter admonishing (*ὑποθετική*) to peace and unity. The subject of this letter is the very subject of S. Clement's letter to the Corinthians. S. Dionysius also wrote to the Athenians a letter, in which he censures them as if they had almost apostatized from the faith. He wrote to the Church of Amastris in Pontus, commanding (*προσάττει*) that church to receive back penitents.² No doubt the churches of Athens and Sparta were afterwards in the province of Corinth; but Amastris was far away in Pontus, and Eusebius mentions all these churches as foreign churches, and contrasts Dionysius' labours for them with his work on behalf of those under his own control (*τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτόν*). If S. Dionysius of Corinth wrote about the year 170 in this sort of way to distant churches, why should not S. Clement of Rome have written a similar letter to the Corinthian Church from seventy to eighty years earlier? And if we cannot rightly deduce from these letters of S. Dionysius that the Church of Corinth had any jurisdiction over Pontus, why should we be required to hold that the letter of S. Clement proves that the Roman Church claimed jurisdiction over Greece, and, in fact, over all the world?

NOTE 52 (see p. 100).—There is another passage in S. Augustine's works which is very similar to the lines of the anti-Donatist ballad quoted in the text, and which bears out my interpretation of the expression, "ab ipsa Petri sede." S. Augustine says in his *Contra Faustum*, "Vides in re quid hac Ecclesiae Catholicae valeat auctoritas, quae ab *ipsis fundatissimis sedibus Apostolorum usque ad hodiernum diem succedentium sibimet episcoporum serie, et tot populorum consensione firmatur.*"³

NOTE 53 (see p. 102).—The meaning of S. Augustine's expression, "unitas in multis," which is applied by him to S. Peter in the passage quoted in the text, may be illustrated by a parallel passage in S. Augustine's *Tractat. cxviii. in Johan. Evang.*, § 4.⁴ He is discussing the symbolism of the dividing our Lord's garments into four parts and the casting lots for the undivided seamless coat, and he says, "Just as in the case of the apostles, though their number also was twelve-fold, or, in other words, fourfold, with three apostles to each division, and though all the apostles were questioned, Peter alone made answer, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God;' and to him it is said, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' as if he alone received the power of binding and loosing: whereas both in that confession he spake as one for them all, and this gift he received with them all *as being the representative of unity itself*: one for all, on the ground that *he is*

¹ *H. E.*, iv. 23.

² S. Dionysius wrote also to the Church of Nicomedia in Bithynia, and to the Churches of Gortyna and Cnossus in Crete. He wrote also to the Roman Church.

³ *Contra Faustum*, lib. xi. cap. 2, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., viii. 219.

⁴ *Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. pars ii. coll. 800, 801.

[symbolically] the unity in all.”¹ Here the expression, “*personam gerens ipsius unitatis*” of the penultimate clause shows that we must understand *symbolically* the statement in the last clause that S. Peter is the “*unitas in omnibus*.” This passage seems to me to corroborate the correctness of the second of the two interpretations of the expression, “*unitas in multis*,” which I have suggested in note I on p. 102.

NOTE 54 (see p. 109). *S. Peter's primacy, as held by representative Anglican divines.*—I have been surprised to notice that Dr. Rivington, in his book entitled *Dependence* (p. 33), says that, “as an Anglican,” he “for a long while held, as a more logical view, that S. Peter excelled the others in natural qualities only;” and in an earlier book entitled *Authority*,² he commits himself to the extraordinary statement that “the idea that all the apostles were equal, except in natural qualities,” is “a fundamental point of Anglican teaching.”³ I cannot imagine what can have led him into such a complete misapprehension. The English divines, handing on the tradition of the Fathers, no doubt teach that the apostles were equal, not only in regard to order, but also in regard to jurisdiction. They deny altogether that any one apostle had jurisdiction over the others; or that the jurisdiction of any one apostle over the Church was of a different kind from the jurisdiction of each of the other apostles over the Church. But while doing full justice to the doctrine of the Fathers about the equality of the apostles, they also do justice to the scriptural and patristic teaching about S. Peter's priority of place, to his leadership or foremanship in the apostolic college. I do not know that any of them identify that leadership with S. Peter's superiority in natural qualities, or suppose that it simply arose out of those natural qualities, without any reference to acts and words of our Blessed Lord. Even if English divines of repute could be found who held such a view (which I doubt), yet assuredly the general tradition of the English Church has been the other way; and it would be absurd to say that the view held by Dr. Rivington, when he was an Anglican, is “a fundamental point of Anglican teaching.”

No doubt S. Peter's leadership among the twelve does not occupy the same important position in Anglican teaching that it occupies in Romanist teaching. From the nature of the case, a priority of place is a much less important matter than a supremacy of jurisdiction; and the difference of view in the estimate of importance is greatly intensified when the priority of place is supposed to belong to S. Peter personally, whereas the supremacy of jurisdiction is supposed to belong to him officially, and to have been transmitted by him to a long line of successors. From the English point of view it is a matter of no

¹ “Sicut in Apostolis cum esset etiam ipse numerus duodenarius, id est, quadripartitus in ternos, et omnes essent interrogati, solus Petrus respondit, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi: et ei dicitur, Tibi dabo claves regni caelorum, tamquam ligandi et solvendi solus acceperit potestatem: cum et illud unus pro omnibus dixerit, et hoc cum omnibus *tamquam personam gerens ipsius unitatis* acceperit: ideo unus pro omnibus, quia *unitas est in omnibus*.”

² *Authority*, p. 59.

³ Compare also *Authority*, pp. 69, 70.

doctrinal importance whether or no S. Peter's priority of place was retained by him to the end of his life ; or, again, whether it had reference to the whole body of the apostles, or to the apostles of the circumcision only. Such questions may afford interesting points for scriptural or patristic investigation, but whichever way they might be decided, they would not affect the substance of our faith ; nor would that faith be affected if we came to the conclusion that, with the evidence at our disposal, they do not admit of any certain answer. S. John and S. James, his brother, had a certain priority along with S. Peter during our Lord's lifetime, and, according to S. Clement of Alexandria, they retained that priority after the Ascension ;¹ but it would be difficult to say whether their priority, such as it was, remained to the end, and whether it related only to the twelve or to other apostles also. Would S. John have taken precedence of S. Paul, or would S. Paul have taken precedence of S. John ? Individual Fathers may perhaps speculate on the matter, but I feel sure that nothing certain has been revealed, and that such questions do not touch the faith.

Our English divines, if they happen to touch on these minor questions, abound each in his own sense. But as regards the more important point of S. Peter's leadership of the apostolic college, at any rate during our Lord's lifetime and during the earlier years of the Church's history, the stream of Anglican teaching has, I should suppose, been quite clear.

Let me give a few examples which happen to come to hand.

Archbishop Potter of Canterbury (A.D. 1737-1747), in his *Discourse of Church Government* (2nd edit., pp. 75-80), discusses the matter very fully. He says that "some of the apostles were superior to the rest, both in personal merit and abilities, and in order of place." He proceeds to prove this by quoting passages from Holy Scripture ; and then states again the conclusion at which he arrives, namely, that "some of the apostles had a pre-eminence above others." Then he goes on to say that "it may be observed further that in most places Peter is preferred before all the rest ; whence our Lord often speaks to him, and he replies before, and, as it were, in the name of the rest." Having adduced various passages from the New Testament in proof, he concludes, that "from these and the like passages, it is evident that Peter was the *foreman* of the college of apostles whilst our Lord lived on earth ; and it is plain that he kept the same dignity at least for some time after His Ascension." Then he elaborates this last point out of the earlier part of the Book of the Acts, and, summing up the result of the argument, he says that "it is evident that S. Peter acted as chief of the college of apostles, and so he is constantly described by the primitive writers of the Church, who call him the Head, the President, the Prolocutor, the Chief, the Foreman of the Apostles, with several other titles of distinction." The archbishop goes on to discuss the qualifications of S. Peter, which rendered him fit to be selected to occupy this position of precedence. It is notorious that the Fathers differ very much among themselves on this point ; some like

¹ See note 2 on pp. 112, 113.

S. Jerome thinking that it was because S. Peter was the eldest,¹ others like Eusebius holding that it was because he was the stronger character, others with greater probability regarding it as the reward of the apostle's great confession. The archbishop says, "Whatever was the true reason of this order, which we will not pretend to determine, since the Scriptures are silent, it is certain that nothing more was founded on it than a mere priority of place; and that neither Peter nor any other apostle had any power or authority over the rest." This he proceeds to prove by the testimony of Holy Scripture, and then he solidly explains the texts which have been misinterpreted by the Romanists, as if they made in favour of their theory of the papal supremacy. Finally, the archbishop shows how the Church was governed by the apostles after they had ceased to live together at Jerusalem, and had dispersed into different parts of the world.

I have given an account of Archbishop Potter's treatment of this subject at some length as a specimen. The views of others may be given more succinctly.

Archbishop Bramhall of Armagh (A.D. 1661-1663), in his *Just Vindication of the Church of England* (chap. v., *Works*, ed. 1842, i. 152, 153), says, "All the twelve apostles were equal in mission, equal in commission, equal in honour, equal in all things, *except priority of order*, without which no society can well subsist." And on p. 154 he speaks "of S. Peter's . . . principality of order." So again in his *Schism Guarded* (chap. i., *Works*, ii. 371), replying to his Romanist adversary, Serjeant, the archbishop says, "If he [Serjeant] had not been a mere novice and altogether ignorant of the tenets of our English Church, he might have known that we have no controversy with S. Peter, nor with any other about the privileges of S. Peter. Let him be 'first, chief, or prince of the apostles,' in that sense wherein the ancient Fathers styled him so. . . . The learned Bishop of Winchester,² (of whom it is no shame for him to learn) might have taught him thus much, not only in his own name, but in the name of the king and Church of England: 'Neither is it questioned among us whether S. Peter had a primacy, but what that primacy was; and whether it were such an one as the pope doth now challenge to himself, and you challenge to the pope; but the king³ doth not deny Peter to have been the prime and prince of the apostles.'⁴"

Bishop Bull, in his reply to Bossuet's queries (*Works*, edit. 1846, ii.

¹ See p. 488.

² Bishop Andrewes.

³ James I.

⁴ See Andrewes' *Respons. ad Apolog. Bellarm.*, cap. i., edit. 1851, p. 17. As I hope that what I write may be of some benefit to readers who may not be acquainted with the Latin language, I observe that when Bishop Andrewes speaks of S. Peter as "the *prince* of the apostles," he does not mean to ascribe to him any monarchical or princely jurisdiction over his brethren. In the Latin the word "princeps" means a person who is *first*, either in time or order. S. Peter is "princeps apostolorum," as being the first in order among them. The English expression, "prince of the apostles," may easily be misunderstood by less instructed persons. Archbishop Bramhall, translating Bishop Andrewes, and writing for scholars, uses the expression without fear of being misinterpreted.

295), cites and adopts the first of the passages which I have just quoted from Bramhall, so that it is clear that he held that S. Peter was invested with a "priority of order" in the college of apostles.

Barrow, in his *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy* (*Suppos. i., Works*, edit. 1818, vol. vi. pp. 48 ff.), discusses carefully four different kinds of primacy, which may belong to a person in respect of others. They are (1) a primacy of merit; (2) a primacy of repute; (3) a primacy of order; and (4) a primacy of jurisdiction. He admits that S. Peter, in respect of the original apostles of the circumcision, possessed the first two kinds of primacy; and he denies that he had any primacy of jurisdiction over any of the apostles either of the circumcision or of the Gentiles. As regards the primacy of order, Barrow is less clear than the other divines to whose opinions I have referred. He thinks that this privilege "may be questioned;" but at the same time he admits that there are probable arguments which may be brought forward in its favour, and he grants that the Fathers "generally seem to countenance it." He enumerates various acts and words of our Blessed Lord which specially concerned S. Peter, and he concludes that by this manner of proceeding "our Lord may seem to have constituted S. Peter the first in order among the apostles, or sufficiently to have hinted His mind for their direction, admonishing them by His example to render unto him a special deference." He gives a very much larger space to the arguments in favour of the primacy of order than to the arguments against it; and I can hardly doubt that he personally inclined towards the view that S. Peter had such a primacy, as the more probable, though in his judgement the probability did not amount to a moral certainty.

Having referred to some of the great names of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I will quote the words of a much-respected bishop who has been lately called to his rest, and whose *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles* has gone through thirteen editions. Bishop Harold Browne says, "We may readily admit that S. Peter had a certain priority among his brother apostles assigned to him by our Blessed Lord;" and this priority he further defines to be a "priority of order," which did not involve "a primacy of power or pre-eminence of jurisdiction."¹ The bishop supports his position with considerable fulness, arguing from Scripture and the Fathers.

I have now quoted Archbishop Potter, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Bull, Dr. Isaac Barrow, and Bishop Harold Browne; and, with the exception of some slight reserve on the part of Dr. Barrow, they all express very clearly their belief in S. Peter's primacy of order. I have carefully avoided any reference to such writers as Bishop Forbes of Brechin, or Dr. Pusey, who might be challenged as representing only one school of theological opinion; and I should certainly suppose that a view handed on with such a large measure of unanimity by such representative prelates and theologians, agreeing as it does with the consentient witness of the Fathers, may claim to be considered the

¹ Article xxxvii. § ii. (*Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, 5th edit., 1860, pp. 803, 804).

normal tradition and teaching of the English Church. I say again that I cannot conceive on what grounds Dr. Rivington can have been led to suppose that the negation of S. Peter's primacy of order "is a fundamental point of Anglican teaching." I am afraid that, if Archbishop Bramhall had been dealing with him, he would have said that he was a "mere novice," and "ignorant of the tenets of our English Church." It is hardly likely that any of my Anglican readers should have fallen into such a curious mistake. If there should be any such, I would urge them to take care lest they also oscillate in this matter from an extreme on the one side to a contrary and far more harmful extreme on the other side.

NOTE 55 (see p. 115).—Dr. J. B. Mayor, in his commentary on the Epistle of S. James (p. 30), points out a reason for supposing that the synodical letter of the Council of Jerusalem "was drawn up by S. James." It would be natural for the president to draft the synodical letter; so Dr. Mayor's observation lends some support to the view that S. James did preside.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LECTURE IV.

NOTE 56 (see p. 131).—Professor Gwatkin, in his *Studies of Arianism* (p. 55), says, "Society in the Nicene age was heathen to an extent we can scarcely realize. The two religions were often so strangely intermingled that it is hard to say which was which. The heathens on one side never quite understood the idea of an exclusive worship; while, on the other, crowds of nominal Christians thought it quite enough to appear in church once or twice a year, and lived exactly like the heathen round them, steeped in superstitions like their neighbours, attending freely their immoral games and dances, and sharing in the sins resulting from them. The free intercourse had its good side, in the easy transition from one system to the other; but it undoubtedly heathenized the Church."

NOTE 57 (see p. 136).—The devout and learned De Valois, who edited the great work of Ammianus Marcellinus, thus describes his author, "Mihi quidem Marcellinus summis quibusque Historiæ scriptoribus comparandus videtur;" and again, "Etsi enim Deorum cultui mancipatus fuit, quod certe negari non potest, ea tamen fide, sinceritate, modestia de Christianorum rebus loquitur, ut nisi ex plurimis locis toto opere sparsis constaret eum cultorem numinum fuisse, Christianus non immerito posset videri." These passages occur in De Valois' preface.

NOTE 58 (see p. 137). *The Council of Nicaea was not convened by the pope.*—If S. Silvester had been the monarch of the Church, and had exercised an authority over the Church such as that which is ascribed to the Roman pontiffs by the Vatican decrees, he would

certainly have himself convoked the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea. This he undoubtedly did not do. The Ecclesiastical writers of the fourth and fifth centuries have much to tell us about the convocation of the council, but with one accord they ascribe that convocation to Constantine. I might quote the words of Eusebius,¹ S. Epiphanius,² Rufinus,³ Socrates,⁴ Sozomen,⁵ Theodoret,⁶ and Gelasius of Cyzicus.⁷ But for the sake of brevity I will confine myself to the statements made by two Ecumenical Councils. And first, the Nicene Council itself, in its letter to the Church of Alexandria, says, "By the grace of God a great and holy synod has been gathered together at Nicaea, our Emperor, Constantine, most beloved of God, having summoned us out of various cities and provinces."⁸ The council says not a word about any action taken in the matter by S. Silvester. It is simply inconceivable that the council should have maintained silence on such a point, if S. Silvester had had any real share in the convocation,⁹ and if the members of the council had regarded him as their infallible monarch. Long afterwards, in the year 680, the unknown author of the *Sermo Acclamatorius*, which was addressed to the Emperor Constantine IV., and which was delivered in his presence during the concluding session of the sixth Ecumenical Council, hazarded the wild assertion that, when Arius the divider of the Trinity arose, "immediately Constantine, *semper Augustus*, and the famous Silvester,¹⁰ assembled a great and illustrious synod in Nicaea."¹¹ If those words expressed the truth, we may be quite certain that the Council of Nicaea would have coupled Silvester with Constantine in the sentence of its synodical letter to the Church of Alexandria, which I have quoted above. It is perhaps a work of supererogation, but I proceed to point out that the witness of the Council of Nicaea is corroborated by the witness of the Council of Ephesus in 430. In the acts of the Ephesine Council there is a *Relatio* of the holy synod, addressed to the Emperors Theodosius II.

¹ Euseb., *Vit. Constantin.*, lib. iii. capp. 4, 5, 6.

² S. Epiphani., *Haer.* lxi. cap. xi.

³ Rufin. *H. E.*, lib. i. cap. 1.

⁴ Socrat. *H. E.*, lib. i. cap. 8.

⁵ Sozom. *H. E.*, lib. i. cap. 17.

⁶ Theodoret. *H. E.*, lib. i. cap. 6 (*al.* 7).

⁷ Gelas. Cyzic., *Comment. Act. Conc. Nicaen.*, lib. i. praef. (Coleti, ii. 117).

⁸ Cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, i. 9.

⁹ The Council of Arles, held in 314, was a council consisting of bishops from Italy, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain. Being a purely Western council, one might have expected that S. Silvester would have had a share in its convocation. Yet the council, writing to the pope, speaks of its members as "having been brought to Arles by the will of the most pious Emperor." The council is entirely silent about any action of the pope (cf. Coleti, i. 1449, 1450).

¹⁰ Dr. Rivington boldly deduces (*Prim. Ch.*, p. 153), from this statement in the *Sermo Acclamatorius*, that "the idea of the Nicene Council was not due to the Emperor, but to the pope himself!"

¹¹ Coleti, vii. 1085. It may be noted that in this same *Sermo Acclamatorius* the council repeats its anathema on Pope Honorius, casting him out from the holy enclosure of the church. The council's anathemas are authoritative, but its historical statement about S. Silvester having joined in the convocation of the Nicene Synod must be taken for what it is worth; and, in fact, its worth is infinitesimally small.

and Valentinian III., on the subject of the deposition of Nestorius. In the course of that *Relatio* the council speaks of the exposition of the apostolic faith made "by the 318 holy Fathers gathered in the metro-political city of Nicaea by Constantine of holy memory."¹

It would of course be *a priori* highly probable that, before convoking the Council of Nicaea, Constantine would take the advice of some of the more influential bishops, especially of those who were near at hand. It may even be true that the proposal to convoke such a council originated with one or other of them. If Constantine had been living in or near Rome, one might conjecturally have credited S. Silvester with the suggestion. As a matter of fact, Constantine was in the East, and the troubles which gave rise to the council, that is to say, the Arian trouble, the Meletian trouble, and the dispute about Easter, were at that stage primarily Eastern questions. Alexandria was the principal centre of disturbance; and S. Epiphanius tells us that it was "in consequence of the painstaking diligence and the stirring exhortations of Alexander, the holy Bishop of Alexandria, that Constantine of blessed memory convoked a synod in the city of Nicaea."² But there was one prelate, whom the Emperor would be certain to consult, and whose advice would weigh more with him than even the exhortations of S. Alexander. There is no need to say that that prelate was Hosius of Cordova. From the year 312 onwards Hosius seems to have been Constantine's chief adviser in ecclesiastical matters. He was continually in attendance at court, and he was certainly with Constantine when the Emperor came to the determination to convoke the Council of Nicaea. Sulpicius Severus, speaking of Hosius, says that "the synod of Nicaea was regarded as having been held at his instigation."³ Thus we have explicit testimony to the fact that the convocation of the council was urged upon the Emperor by at least two bishops, namely, by Hosius and by S. Alexander. We may conclude that Rufinus speaks accurately when he says, "Then he [Constantine] in accordance with episcopal advice summons a council of bishops to meet in the city of Nicaea."⁴ It is of course impossible to demonstrate that S. Silvester did not write to Constantine, urging him to summon a council. All we can say is that there is not a particle of proof that he did so. No writer of the fourth or fifth centuries⁵ thinks it worth while to mention the fact, if it was a fact. And the probability is that Constantine would come to a decision after taking the advice of the bishops within his reach. In any case, S. Silvester cannot have intervened in the matter in any public way; for, if he had, some mention of such an important fact must have come down to us. It is not possible to imagine a general council of the Roman communion being convoked now, without the action of the pope being very much *en evidence*. It is

¹ *Concil. Ephes.* Actio i. (Coleti, iii. 1100).

² S. Epiph., *Haer.* lxxviii. cap. 4.

³ Sulp. Sever. *Hist. Sacr.*, lib. ii. cap. 40, *P. L.*, xx. 152. "Nicaena synodus auctore illo confecta habebatur."

⁴ Rufin. *H. E.*, lib. i. cap. i., *P. L.*, xxi. 467. "Tum ille ex sacerdotum sententia apud urbem Nicaeam episcopale concilium convocat."

⁵ The writers of the sixth century are equally silent, but they are too far removed from the Nicene Council to make it of any use to lay stress in such a matter on what they do or do not say.

for papalist writers to explain¹ why the state of things was so different in the fourth century. Surely, one would expect a monarch to summon his parliament.

NOTE 59 (see note 1 on p. 138).—The Council of Arles (314) in its second synodical letter to Pope Silvester heads its letter as follows, “Domino sanctissimo fratri Silvestro Marinus vel coetus episcoporum qui adunati fuerunt in oppido Arelatensi” (see Hefele, *Councils*, E. tr., i. 184). The wording of this inscription seems to make it clear that Marinus of Arles presided.

NOTE 60 (see note 6 on p. 138).—On the whole subject of the sixth Nicene canon compare Dr. Bright’s *Notes on the Canons of Nicaea* (pp. 22–26), and also his *Roman See in the Early Church* (pp. 75–81, and pp. 481–483). Rufinus (*Hist. Eccl.*, i. 6, P. L., xxi. 473) defines the sphere of the pope’s jurisdiction, to which an implicit allusion is made in the canon, as consisting of the suburbicarian churches. Such a definition conveys a true representation of the sphere of the pope’s metropolitan jurisdiction in the beginning of the fifth century, when Rufinus published his history. But at the time of the Council of Nicaea that sphere included the whole of Italy. See the Additional Note 1, p. 434.

NOTE 61 (see p. 141).—It must be said that during the years which followed the Nicene Council there was one important matter, in connexion with which the Church of Rome, under the guidance of S. Julius, committed herself to the wrong side. That matter was the formal approval which was given by Rome in 340 to Marcellus of Ancyra.² On

¹ I will here put on record what must be called Dr. Rivington’s grotesque account of S. Silvester’s view of the situation. He says (*Prim. Ch.*, pp. 159–161): “The way, then, in which S. Silvester elected to govern the Church was by a council in the East, which the Emperor hailed for the fulfilment of his own desire for the unity of the Church as the safeguard of his empire. S. Silvester knew well that papal infallibility does not act like magic. . . . S. Silvester considered that the circumstances of the case demanded the apparatus of a council rather than an *ex cathedra* judgement from himself.” This is of a truth making bricks without either clay or straw.

² Some time before 336 Marcellus wrote his book against Asterius the sophist. Extracts from this book have been preserved by Eusebius of Cæsarea in his replies to it. It is from these extracts that our knowledge of the teachings of Marcellus is principally derived. Cardinal Newman, in his first *Dissertationum critica-theologica* (*Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical*, pp. 20, 21), has given a conspectus of the principal points in the Marcellian heresy, gathering them out of Eusebius’ replies. Newman points out that there is no good reason for throwing doubt on Eusebius’ testimony, which is corroborated in various ways. It is true that the Council of Sardica tried to whitewash Marcellus, on the ground that the statements, which Marcellus had made as an inquirer, had been wrongly taken by his opponents as if they represented his avowed opinions. But, as Bishop Lightfoot says (Smith and Wace, *D. C. B.*, s.v. *Eusebius of Cæsarea*, ii. 342), “The quotations given by Eusebius speak for themselves.” And similarly the Jesuit Petavius (*De Trin.*, I. xiii. ii.) observes: “As far as we can gather from Marcellus’ own words, quoted by Eusebius, it appears that he taught seriously, and as the expression of his own opinion, some altogether absurd and heretical things.” S. Basil and the Eastern Church had good grounds for the horror with which they regarded Marcellus’ teaching. See also p. 231, note 2, and p. 236.

this personage, and on his heretical opinions, see Dr. Robertson (*S. Athanasius, Prolegomena*, pp. xxxv., xxxvi., xlv., and also p. 116, note 5), and see also Dr. Bright (*S. Athanasius' Orations against the Arians, Introduction*, p. xlv.), and Cardinal Newman (*Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical*, p. 182). Hefele says of Marcellus, "Neither does Marcellus present the idea of a true God-man, but sees in the miraculously born JESUS a man in whom the Logos, the *ἐνέργεια δραστηκή* of God, dwells. . . . Thus Marcellus, to a certain extent like Paul of Samosata, makes Christ a man in whom God dwells."¹ Dr. Gwatkin says of S. Julius, "His one serious mistake was in supporting Marcellus" . . . "Knowing . . . what his [Marcellus'] doctrine was, we must admit that the Easterns were right in resenting its deliberate approval at Rome."² See also p. 291, note 1, and p. 325, note 4.

NOTE 62 (see p. 142).—Hefele has shown very conclusively that the canons of Sardica do not allow the appeal of a bishop from the sentence of the synod of his province to be heard at Rome. The appeal must be heard in the neighbourhood of the province to which the bishop belonged. See Hefele's *Councils*, E. tr., ii. 117, 118, 124-128.

NOTE 63 (see note 1 on p. 149). *Reasons for supposing that the see of Aquileia became a metropolitan see before the death of Constantius.*—I will set down in this note some facts which seem to me to make it highly probable that the Bishop of Aquileia was a metropolitan, not only in the early part of the fifth century,³ but also during the last forty years of the previous century.

1. When at the Easter festival of the year 404 the persecution of S. Chrysostom, which had been going on for some months, was reaching its climax, the saint addressed a long letter to the most influential bishops of the Western Church, imploring their help and countenance. Three copies of this letter were sent, one addressed to Innocent, Bishop of Rome, another to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, and the third to Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia. Innocent and Venerius were undoubtedly metropolitans; and the fact that S. Chrysostom appealed for help to Chromatius, in exactly the same terms as those which he employed in his letters to Innocent and Venerius, supplies a strong reason for believing that Chromatius also was a metropolitan. The persecuted saint, having shown how iniquitous and uncanonical the proceedings against him had been, implores these three great prelates to write letters declaring the said proceedings to be null and void, and making it clear that his communion with them remained unbroken.⁴

2. In the year 402 S. Jerome wrote his *Apology against the Books of Rufinus*. In the course of an attack on S. Epiphanius, Rufinus had

¹ Hefele, *Councils*, E. tr., ii. 32.

² Gwatkin, *The Arian Controversy*, p. 67.

³ The fact that Aquileia was metropolitan in the time of S. Leo (440-461) is outside of all possible dispute (cf. S. Leon. *Ep.* i. *ad Aquileiensem Episcopum*, cap. ii. and *Ep.* ii. *ad Septimum Episcopum Alineensem*, cap. i., *P. L.*, liv. 593, 597).

⁴ Cf. S. Chrysost. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., tom. iii. p. 520.

declared that the reason why certain persons were helping forward the conspiracy against Origen was, because they were accustomed in their discourses and books to plagiarize from Origen, and they wished to deter men from reading that author, lest their thefts from him should be discovered. S. Jerome replies, "Who are these persons? . . . You ought to give their names, and to specify the men themselves. Are the blessed Bishops Anastasius and Theophilus and Venerius and Chromatius and the whole synod of the Catholics, both in the East and in the West, to be esteemed to be plagiarists of Origen's books, because, being moved by the same Spirit, they have pronounced a similar sentence, and publicly denounce Origen as a heretic?"¹ In this passage S. Jerome, besides making a general reference to the whole episcopate of the East and West, selects four representative names, namely (1) the Pope of Rome, (2) the Pope of Alexandria, (3) the Metropolitan of Milan, and (4) S. Chromatius of Aquileia. It seems clear to me that Aquileia was a metropolitical see in 402.

3. At the Council of Aquileia, held in 381, S. Ambrose was present, and was in many respects the mouthpiece and leader of the assembly. Nevertheless, in the first paragraph of the acts of the council, which contains a list of the bishops who took part in it, the name of S. Valerian of Aquileia occurs first, and the name of S. Ambrose second.² And similarly, in the list of those present, which is found at the end of the acts, S. Valerian heads the list and S. Ambrose follows immediately after him.³ It seems to me impossible to suppose that a suffragan bishop would take precedence of his metropolitan in a council attended not only by bishops of the province, but by the representatives of distant churches. Bishops from Africa, Gaul, and Western Illyricum sat at this council along with bishops from North Italy. And when one remembers the unique position which S. Ambrose occupied in the West, the closeness of his relations with the Emperor, and the way in which distant churches referred to him as an oracle,⁴ the impression is forced upon one that he certainly would have occupied the first place, if the bishop of the city where the council was held had not been as much a metropolitan as he was himself,⁵ and

¹ S. Hieron. *Apol. adv. libr. Rufin.*, ii. 22, *P. L.*, xxiii. 445.

² S. Ambros. *Opp.*, *P. L.*, xvi. 955.

³ *P. L.*, xvi. 979.

⁴ Duchesne (*Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 2^e édit., p. 32) says, "L'influence d'Ambroise se fait sentir souvent dans les affaires de l'église orientale, à Antioche, à Césarée, à Constantinople, à Thessalonique; c'est lui qui est chargé de donner un évêque à Sirmium dans un moment critique. À Aquilée, il dirige un concile où se règlent les dernières difficultés laissées par la crise arienne dans le pays du bas Danube. Mais c'est surtout en Gaule et en Espagne que l'on semble considérer l'autorité ecclésiastique de Milan comme un tribunal supérieur et ordinaire." On p. 35 Duchesne says, "Il y a donc, en Occident, vers la fin du IV^e Siècle, une tendance universelle à considérer l'évêque de Milan comme une autorité de premier ordre, à l'associer au pape dans les fonctions de magistrat ecclésiastique suprême, de juge des causes majeures et d'interprète des lois disciplinaires générales."

⁵ The Ballerini, in their *Observationes in Dissert. v. Quesnelli* (pars ii. cap. v. § 2, *P. L.*, lv. 607), speaking of the precedence of bishops at councils, say, "Neque enim post horum [sc. metropolitaram] institutionem in more fuit ut metropolitani (quicumque adessent) simplici episcopo quantumvis antiquiori locum cederent."

still more, if that bishop had been one of his own suffragans. It has often been the case, both in earlier and later times, that councils have had more than one president; and to me it seems probable that S. Valerian and S. Ambrose were joint presidents of the Council of Aquileia. S. Valerian, on account of his seniority by consecration, and on account of the synod being held in his cathedral city, would be reckoned as first president, and S. Ambrose would be second president. But while the place of highest dignity was reserved for the older prelate, one can well imagine that S. Valerian would be the first to wish that the practical work of conducting the proceedings should be left in the competent hands of his junior colleague. Or it may be that the Emperor, who convoked the council, had by some authoritative act made S. Ambrose to be the "causae cognitor." Any way, it seems evident that in 381 the Bishop of Aquileia was a metropolitan.¹

4. Some confirmation of this conclusion seems to result from the fact that the synodical epistle of the Council of Constantinople, held in 382, is addressed to Damasus of Rome, Ambrose of Milan, Britonius of Trier,² Valerian of Aquileia, Acholius of Thessalonica, Anemius of Sirmium, and to the other bishops assembled in the city of Rome.³ Here Valerian of Aquileia is named before Acholius of Thessalonica, who was undoubtedly a metropolitan and more than a metropolitan, being the vicar of the Roman see throughout Eastern Illyricum, and in that capacity having metropolitans subject to him.⁴

5. In this connexion it is worth mentioning that there is no evidence that either S. Valerian or S. Chromatius ever attended any of the provincial synods held at Milan during the episcopate of S. Ambrose, or that S. Ambrose ever exercised in any way metropolitical jurisdiction over them.⁵ Such jurisdiction cannot be safely inferred from the fact that in 388 he probably consecrated S. Chromatius at Aquileia. If the consecration had taken place at Milan, the case might be different. In the

¹ It is fair to say that Duchesne is of opinion (*Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 2^{de} édit., pp. 30, 31) that at first the whole of the Vicariate of Italy was subject to the metropolitical jurisdiction of Milan. He goes on to say, "Vers le commencement du cinquième siècle, ce ressort fut divisé en deux par l'institution de la métropole d'Aquilée." I am ready to admit that in the early part of the fifth century the province of Aquileia was enlarged at the expense of the province of Milan by the transfer of the bishops of Western Venetia to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Aquileia. But I cannot think that at the Council of Aquileia in 381 S. Valerian was a mere suffragan of S. Ambrose.

² Trier was the capital of Gaul and the chief place of imperial residence in that country, in fact, the second capital (Milan being the first) of the whole Western empire. It seems to me the more probable view that there were still no metropolitans in Gaul in 382, and that therefore Britonius owes his precedence to the imperial dignity of his city. Britonius should, I think, be identified with Pritannius, who was Bishop of Trier in 383 (cf. Sulpic. Sever. *Hist. Sacr.*, ii. 49, P. L., xx. 157).

³ Cf. Coleti, ii. 1143.

⁴ Compare p. 157.

⁵ S. Ambrose's province extended into Venetia, at least into its Western portion. This can be established by passages in the fifth and sixth letters of the Saint which are addressed to Syagrius of Verona. I do not think that S. Ambrose's fifth letter (§ 8) proves that Altinum in Eastern Venetia belonged to his province. In the time of S. Leo the whole of Venetia belonged to the province of Aquileia.

fifth and sixth centuries the metropolitans of Aquileia used to consecrate the metropolitans of Milan at Milan, and the metropolitans of Milan used to consecrate the metropolitans of Aquileia at Aquileia.¹ S. Ambrose's action in 388 may have been one of the precedents on which the later custom was based.

6. In the Roman synod under Damasus, which condemned and deposed Auxentius of Milan, and which was held near the end of the year 371,² a synodical epistle was addressed to the bishops of Illyricum, the inscription of which ran thus: "The bishops assembled in sacred synod at Rome, Damasus, Valerian, and the rest, to the beloved brethren, the bishops established in Illyricum, health in the Lord."³ Here the special mention of Valerian, and his being placed in juxtaposition with Damasus, suggest that he, like Damasus, was already a metropolitan in 371. In the synodical epistle to which reference has been made, it is mentioned that the Bishops of Venetia⁴ and of Gaul had complained, presumably to Damasus, that Auxentius of Milan and other bishops were embracing heretical opinions. If the bishops of Venetia took any common action, they must have had S. Valerian of Aquileia as their leader.

I do not think that it is at all probable that Auxentius would have consented to have his province diminished by the erection of Aquileia into a metropolitanical see, with an opponent like S. Valerian as its occupant. I am therefore inclined to think that the see of Aquileia became metropolitanical before the accession of S. Valerian, and, if so, it would seem to me probable that the new provinces of Milan and Aquileia were separated from the Roman province at the same time. I have stated elsewhere⁵ that the most likely time would appear to be the period from 356 onwards, when, first Felix II., and afterwards Liberius were living in great subservience to the heretical Emperor, Constantius. Fortunatian of Aquileia had joined the Emperor's communion,⁶ and Auxentius, the newly-appointed Bishop of Milan, also belonged to it. Constantius' ecclesiastical advisers were, for the most part, Eastern bishops, who

¹ Cf. Pelag. I. *Ep. ad Joann. Patric.*, P. L., lxix. 411.

² Some authorities assign this synod, in my opinion wrongly, to the year 369. Compare pp. 299 and 543.

³ Coleti, ii. 1041.

⁴ I have retained the reading *Venetensium*, in deference to the concordant testimony of Theodoret, Sozomen, and the Latin *codex* used by Holstenius. In the Latin translation of the *Patrum Testimonia*, put forward in his defence by Eutyches at the Constantinopolitan Council of 448, which has been published by Dom Amelli in the *Spicilegium Casinense* (pp. 98, 99) from the Cod. Novar. xxx. (66), the reading is *Bessorum* in lieu of *Venetensium*. Cassiodorus (*Hist. Tripart.*, v. 29, P. L., lxix. 1006) has *Venetorum*.

⁵ See p. 434.

⁶ S. Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus*, cap. xcviij., P. L., xxiii. 697) says of Fortunatian, "In hoc habetur detestabilis, quod Liberium, Romanæ urbis episcopum, pro fide ad exsilium pergentem, primus sollicitavit ac fregit, et ad subscriptionem hæreseos compulit." On which passage Bishop Hefele observes (*Councils*, E. tr., ii. 236), "According to this, Fortunatian had advised (*sollicitavit*) Pope Liberius to this weakness when he was first going into exile, and subsequently, after his return to Sirmium, actually seduced him into it (*fregit*)." Hefele (*Op. cit.*, p. 210) says that it was at the Council of Milan in 355 that Fortunatian subscribed against Athanasius, and entered into communion with the Arians.

were accustomed to a state of things in which metropolitan sees were much more plentiful than they had hitherto been in the West.¹

NOTE 64 (see note 2 on p. 149). *The metropolitan system was introduced into Spain before 386.*—In February, 385, Pope Siricius, who had been recently consecrated to the see of Rome, wrote a letter to Himerius, the Metropolitan of Tarraco in Spain, in which he replied to certain questions which Himerius had addressed to Siricius' predecessor, Damasus. In the last chapter of this letter Siricius requests Himerius to make known its contents "to all our fellow bishops" [in Spain], and he begs "that those things which by a salutary regulation have been determined by us, may be sent with a covering letter from thee, not only to the bishops who are established in thine own province (in tua dioecesi), but also to all the bishops of Carthaginensis, Baetica, Lusitania, and Gallaecia."² In the same paragraph Siricius implies that Himerius has held the see of Tarraco for a long while.³ The whole passage makes it perfectly clear that the province of Tarraconensis had a metropolitan in 385, and that the sphere of that metropolitan's jurisdiction did not extend outside the limits of the civil province. It is hardly possible to throw doubt on the conclusion that, if one of the five Spanish provinces had at that time a metropolitan, then each of the other four provinces was organized in a similar manner.

NOTE 65 (see p. 151). *Spain seems to have been administered by a proconsul during the later years of Gratian's reign.*—I wish in this note to justify my statement that from about the year 370 to the early part of the year 383, or at least to the latter part of 382, Spain was administered by a proconsul.

Sulpicius Severus, speaking of Priscillian and his followers after their return to Spain from Italy in 382, says: "Haeretici corrupto *Volventio proconsule vires suas confirmaverant.*"⁴ And a little further on in the same paragraph Sulpicius, speaking of the action taken by the Priscillianists a few months later, says, "Haeretici suis artibus, grandi pecunia Macedonio data, obtinent ut imperiali auctoritate praefecto erepta cognitio Hispaniarum vicario (*nam jam proconsulem habere desierant*) . . ."⁵ Here, unfortunately, there is a slight *lacuna* in the text. However, it is clear that, if we are to believe Sulpicius Severus, a Vicar had been substituted for a Proconsul in Spain,⁶ either in the latter part of 382 or

¹ There are no signs of either Milan or Aquileia being metropolitan at the time of the Council of Sardica.

² *P. L.*, xiii. 1146.

³ "Pro antiquitate sacerdotii tui."

⁴ *Hist. Sacr.*, ii. 49, *P. L.*, xx. 157.

⁵ *Ubi supra.*

⁶ It seems very difficult to believe that Sulpicius Severus made a mistake when he committed himself to this categorical statement about the change in the government of Spain. He had probably reached man's estate when the asserted change took place, and he was living in the neighbouring country of Gaul. He was by profession a lawyer, and was also a historian, and he belonged to what may be called the governing class, as he married a wealthy woman of consular rank. His statement was made in his *Historia Sacra*, written about twenty years after

early in 383. The historian gives the note of time in the next sentence, where he says, "Jam tum rumor incesserat Clementem Maximum intra Britannias sumpsisse imperium ac brevi in Gallias erupturum."¹

There is a law of Gratian's, dated from Milan on May 26, 382, which is addressed "ad Proconsules, Vicarios, omnesque Rectores."² The law, emanating as it did from Gratian, was intended for the Western empire. Ordinarily there was only one proconsul in the West, the Proconsul of Africa. The plural "Proconsules" shows that in May, 382, there was more than one Western proconsul. This fact supplies a strong confirmation of the statement made by Sulpicius Severus.

A further confirmation of the fact that in the summer of 382 there was more than one proconsul in the West, may be derived from the expression, "sive a proconsulibus," in Gratian's rescript, *Ordinariorum sententiae*, addressed to Aquilinus, the *Vicarius Urbis*. The expression occurs in the passage which I have quoted in the note on p. 146. The rescript has in view only the Western empire, and it belongs, as I hope to show, to the summer of the year 382.³

We have convincing proof that in May, 383, there was, as Sulpicius Severus would lead us to suppose, a vicar in Spain; for on May 27, 383,⁴ Gratian addressed a law from Padua to Marinianus, the "Vicarius Hispaniarum."

The Code supplies us with evidence of vicars in Spain from 336 to 370. It supplies us with no evidence of their presence there between 370 and 383; and it is my opinion that at any rate during the latter part of that period proconsuls were substituted in Spain for vicars. This is also the view taken by Godefroy (Gothofredus). In his commentary on *Cod. Theod.*, ix. 1, 14, he says that between the time of Constantine and the time of Valentinian II. "totius Hispaniae administrationem quater variasse."⁵ He adds, "Primum scilicet sub Comitibus ea fuit, non ad annum usque Dom. 332, ut docet lex 6 Cod. Just. *de servis fugit.*, vel ad A.D. 334 usque, ut docet lex 3 supr. *de maternis bonis* [*Cod. Theod.*, viii. 18, 3]: verum ad annum usque 336, lex 8 *de naviculariis* [*Cod. Theod.*, xiii. 5, 8]. Secundo: Mox *Vicariis* ea paruit, jam ab ann. 336 ad ann. 370 usque: ut ostendit lex 5 [? 6] supr. *de sponsalibus* [*Cod. Theod.*, iii. 5, 6], et lex 2 supr. *de tabulariis* [*Cod. Theod.*, viii. 2, 2]. Tertio: Post annum 370 Proconsules habere coepit: Itaque et lex 11 infr. *de medicis* [*Cod. Theod.*, xiii. 3, 11], quae data est A.D. 376, docet unam tantum Galliarum dioecesim tum sub Praefecto praetorio fuisse:⁶ et ejusdem the change occurred. He was specially well informed about the affairs of the Priscillianists.

¹ Maximus seems to have invaded Gaul in May, 383. Gratian was still in Italy on June 17 in that year. Compare Rauschen (*Jahrbücher*, p. 142), Tillemont (*Histoire des Empereurs*, edit. 1701, v. 177), and Goyau (*Chronologie de l'Empire Romain*, p. 577).

² *Cod. Theod.*, xi. 6, 1.

³ See *Excursus I.* on pp. 510-528, and the Chronological Table on p. 542.

⁴ *Cod. Theod.*, ix. 1, 14. In Haenel's edition of the Code this law is dated, "vi. Kal. Jun.;" and this reading agrees with the result at which Tillemont arrives (*Empereurs*, v. 722, 723).

⁵ *Codex Theodosianus*, ed. Ritter, tom. iii. p. 22.

⁶ Godefroy's argument, derived from *Cod. Theod.* xiii. 3, 11, seems to me to be less convincing than the others which he uses in this passage.

Gratiani et Valentiniani Jun., A.D. 382, constitutio exstat 'ad *Proconsules*, *Vicarios*, omnesque *Rectores*' lege unica infra *de superindicto* [*Cod. Theod.*, xi. 6, 1], cum alias in occidente unus tantum Africae proconsul esset. Quarto: Mox (post decennium circiter ab ann. D. 383) ad *Vicarios* reditum est, ut haec lex collata cum insigni Severi Sulpicii loco (*Hist. Sacr.* lib. ii. cap. 49) neque dum intellecto, ostendit." And then Godefroy goes on to quote the passages from Sulpicius' *Historia Sacra* which have been cited in the beginning of this note.¹

NOTE 66 (see p. 155).—In the first two editions of this book I expressed the opinion² that the Roman synod's³ petition, in the section which prays for the re-enactment of Valentinian's rules for the trial of bishops, dealt only with the case of the bishops of Italy and Illyricum, but that Gratian by his rescript to Aquilinus enlarged the scope of his father's edict and extended the range of the incidence of the law to the whole Western empire.⁴ I based this theory on the fact that in its enumeration of the officials who would have to enforce the law, the petition only mentions the Prefects of the praetorium of Italy and the Vicarius of Rome; whereas Gratian's rescript makes a much fuller enumeration, mentioning, as it does, the pretorian Prefects of Gaul and of Italy, together with the proconsuls and vicars.

I now think that the theory of Gratian having enlarged the scope of Valentinian's edict is not supported by the facts. The synod's mention of the Prefects of Italy and the Vicarius of Rome occurs in a clause of the petition which deals with the nearer regions, that is, as I have shown, with the suburbicarian vicariate.⁵ The synod *per incuriam* makes no provision for the case of a recalcitrant suburbicarian bishop who should have found his way into Gaul or Spain or Britain, and who should need to be coerced by the local magistrates of those more distant parts and sent by them under safe custody to Rome. But in a later clause of the petition, in which the synod deals with the case of bishops whose dioceses were situated outside the suburbicarian vicariate, the petitioners ask that an accused bishop may be brought for trial before his metropolitan, "*per locorum judicia*." I see now what I did not see, when I was preparing the earlier editions of this book, namely, that the italicized phrase, *per locorum judicia*, refers to the tribunals of the great magistrates of the empire,⁶ whether prefects, proconsuls or vicars, who within

¹ The reader may also be referred to Godefroy's commentary on *Cod. Theod.*, xiii. 3, 11 (*Codex Theodosianus*, ed. Ritter, 1741, tom. v. p. 47).

² See pp. 156, 157 of the first two editions.

³ I refer to the Roman synod under Damasus, to which I now assign the date 382, and which addressed to Gratian and Valentinian II. the synodical petition, *Et hoc gloriae vestrae*.

⁴ The passages in the Roman petition and in the rescript of Gratian, to which I am here referring, will be found quoted in the note on pp. 145, 146.

⁵ See pp. 147, 150, 151.

⁶ Dr. Rivington, wrongly, as it seems to me, translates or paraphrases (*Prim. Church*, p. 241) the words, "ad metropolitani per locorum judicia deducatur examen," as follows, "the trial may be held before the metropolitan for local decision (*per locorum judicia*)," as if the *judicia* were the decisions of the metropolitan, whereas they are evidently the tribunals of the imperial officials. I must confess that I fell myself into the same mistake in the first two editions of this book. It may be

their several circumscriptions exercised jurisdiction in the more distant regions. So understood, the scope of the petition agrees with the scope of the rescript, a result which is *a priori* more probable.

It should be noticed that Gratian, who usually in the wording of his rescript follows closely the expressions used in the petition, here gives a different turn to the sentence, and empowers the courts of the prefects, vicars, and proconsuls all over the Western empire to deal with accused bishops whose sees were situated in the nearer regions, as well as with accused bishops whose sees were situated in the more distant regions. This correction of the synod's phraseology secured a more complete accomplishment of the synod's wishes and intentions.

NOTE 67 (see p. 166). *On a passage in S. Jerome's treatise against Jovinian.*—There is a passage in S. Jerome's treatise against Jovinian (lib. i. § 26, *P. L.*, xxiii. 247) which has been curiously misunderstood, as if it favoured the Romanist view of S. Peter's relation to the other apostles, whereas in truth the passage, taken as a whole, is in thorough agreement with the ordinary Catholic teaching on that subject. S. Jerome is proving to Jovinian that S. John the Evangelist was a *virgin* disciple; and he says, "If he was not a virgin, let Jovinian explain why he was more beloved than the other apostles. But you reply that the Church is founded on Peter, though in another place the same is attributed to all the apostles, and all of them receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the solidity of the Church is established equally upon them all; still, among the twelve one is therefore chosen, that by the appointment of a head an *occasion of dissension may be taken away* (schismatis tollatur occasio). But why was not John chosen, who was a virgin? Deference was paid to age, because Peter was the elder, lest one, who was still a young man and almost a boy, should be given precedence before men of mature age (progressae aetatis hominibus praeferretur); and lest the good Master, *who felt bound to remove from His disciples an occasion of strife* (qui occasionem jurgii debuerat auferre discipulis), and who had also said to them, 'My peace I give unto you; peace I leave with you,' and who had also said, 'Whosoever would be great among you, let him be the least of all'—[lest He, I say,] should seem to furnish a cause of grudge against the young man whom He loved. . . . Peter was an apostle, and John was an apostle, the first married, the second a virgin. But *Peter was nothing else than an apostle* (sed Petrus apostolus tantum); John was both an apostle, and an evangelist, and a prophet." The Romanists are accustomed to quote a few words out of this passage in order to show that in it S. Jerome taught the doctrine that S. Peter was (and by implication the reigning pope is) the divinely appointed centre and root of unity in the Church. They say that S. Jerome teaches that S. Peter was appointed a head, that "*the occasion of schism might be removed.*" But, if S. Jerome had thought that S. Peter was invested with such a headship

noted that Merenda interprets "*per locorum judicia*" in the same way as I have now been led to do (cf. Merend. *de S. Damasi opusculis et gestis*, cap. xvi. i., *P. L.*, xiii. 206). One may compare the expression "*ad judicia competentia*" in the letter, *Benedictus Deus* of the Council of Aquileia (*Ep. inter Ambrosianas* x. § 8, *P. L.*, xvi. 983).

as that, his whole argument would have crumbled to pieces. He wants to show the complete equality of the apostles in their relation to the Church. But if one of them had been appointed by our Lord the necessary centre of unity, that equality would have existed no longer. The solidity of the Church would not in that case be "equally established upon them all." S. Jerome, as a matter of fact, attributes to S. Peter a very different kind of headship. It is like the headship of the foreman in a jury, or like the headship of the Duke of Norfolk among our English peers. Such a headship, which is in fact a mere primacy of order, would not affect the equality of the apostles in their relation to the Church. The Romanist mistake has arisen from not noticing that S. Jerome, when he says that our Lord took away an *occasion* of dissension, is referring to the disputes which used to take place among the disciples as to which of them should be greatest. S. Jerome thinks that our Lord gave a primacy of order to one of the twelve that "*an occasion of dissension might be taken away*" (*schismatis tollatur occasio*); just as he also thinks that "the good Master" chose S. Peter, the elder, rather than S. John, the younger, to be the head, in order that He might remove another "*occasion of strife*" (*occasionem jurgii*). It was no doubt the word "*schisma*" which caused the mistake. That word is sometimes used in the technical sense of *schism*. But it is also used, both in Latin and Greek, in the untechnical sense of *dissension*. For example, S. John uses the word *σχίσμα* in three passages of his Gospel (S. John vii. 43; ix. 16; x. 19); and always in the sense of a *dissension*, or *dispute*, or angry *division of opinion*. In the Vulgate, S. Jerome has rendered the word *σχίσμα* by "*dissensio*" in S. John vii. 43 and in S. John x. 19; but in S. John ix. 16, where the sense is precisely the same, he has used the word "*schisma*." No one would suggest *schism* as the right English translation of S. Jerome's "*schisma*" in S. John ix. 16; it there plainly means *dissension*; and the whole argument requires that a similar meaning should be attributed to it in the treatise against Jovinian. In a letter to Evangelus (*Ep.* cxlvi., *Opp.*, ed. Vallars., i. 1076) S. Jerome speaks of one among a body of presbyters being made a bishop "as a preventive against schism" (in *schismatis remedium*). Here the word "*schismatis*" has undoubtedly its technical meaning, *schism*. The sense of the word varies according to the context. It is worth noticing that S. Jerome wrote his treatise against Jovinian in the year 393, twelve years after the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, and eight years after his departure from Rome in considerable wrath with the Roman clergy. The admirable teaching on the equality of the apostles which is contained in this treatise, illustrates Mr. Gore's view that S. Jerome changed his tone about the position and privileges of the Roman bishop after the death of Damasus at the end of the year 384 (see Gore's *Church and the Ministry*, 1st edit., p. 172). Closer acquaintance with the local Roman Church seems to have led S. Jerome to reconsider some of the views which he had expressed in his letters to Damasus, and thus a remedy was provided for the somewhat papalizing tone which he had imbibed in Rome during his catechumenate. S. Jerome's faith was in fact purified, and brought up nearer to the normal level of the faith of the saints.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON LECTURE V.

NOTE 68 (see p. 194). *African bishops were forbidden to appeal to Rome.*—Dr. Rivington begins his account of the dispute about Apiarius by a most remarkable begging of the whole question. He says, "But a question arose as to the best method of exercising this jurisdiction of the see of Peter over the Church of North Africa. The course of appeal was in the case of bishops, first to the province, next to a general synod, and then to Rome."¹ Some pages further on he says again, "The ideal of church government in the eyes of the North African Church was not that there should be no appeal to Rome in the case of bishops—not that they should act independently of Rome, but that the authority of the apostolic see should be exercised through the medium of an episcopal commission, consisting of African bishops, and not by a legate sent from Rome itself."² This last sentence supplies a typical instance of the amazing rashness which so often leads Dr. Rivington to commit himself to statements, in support of which no particle of evidence can be brought forward. Any one who cares to do so, may safely challenge Roman Catholic controversialists to produce one single sentence from any single Father or council which shows that the North African ideal of church government during the flourishing period of African Church history³ was what Dr. Rivington here declares it to have been. On the other hand, passage after passage might be quoted, which prove to demonstration that according to the North African ideal all disciplinary causes, whether connected with bishops or with persons inferior in rank to bishops, should be settled in Africa by the regular hierarchy of the African Church, without any appeal to Rome whatsoever.

No doubt, evil-living and recalcitrant bishops existed in Africa as well as elsewhere, and, when they had been condemned by the highest court of appeal in Africa, they would from time to time endeavour to make a fresh appeal to the one apostolic see in the West. But it was just these occasional attempts of disloyal persons which compelled the African Church to forbid appeals to Rome in the most peremptory way. The twenty-eighth canon of the African code, after allowing priests, deacons, and clerks in minor orders to appeal from the judgement of their own bishop to that of the neighbouring bishops, goes on to say, "But if they shall think that it is desirable to appeal from these, let them not appeal *ad transmarina judicium* [*i.e.* to Rome], but to the primates of their own provinces or to an African general council, *as has often been decreed concerning bishops*. But if any one shall think fit to appeal *ad transmarina*, let him not be received to communion by any one within the limits of Africa."⁴ It should be noted that the clause printed in

¹ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 297.

² *Ibid.*, p. 301.

³ That is to say, until the Vandal invasion in 428.

⁴ *P. L.*, lxxvii. 192, "Quod si et ab eis provocandum putaverint, non provocent ad transmarina judicium, sed ad primates suarum provinciarum, sicut et de episcopis

italics, "as has often been decreed concerning bishops," is found in all the manuscript copies of the Carthaginian Council which was held in May, 419, whether they be copies of the original Latin acts or of the Greek translation of the same.¹ It is also found in the collection of African canons inserted by Dionysius Exiguus in his code; and its genuineness is admitted, both by the Ballerini² and by Hefele,³ who, however, in an arbitrary way try to limit the scope of the italicized clause, so that the decrees concerning bishops, to which reference is made, shall not be supposed to have prohibited bishops from appealing to Rome. But any one who will read the canon carefully will see that the principal object of its framers was to restrain appeals, so that they should not go beyond the borders of Africa; and the construction of the sentence makes it clear that the former decrees, to which reference is made in the clause about bishops, forbade bishops also to appeal *ad transmarina*.⁴

As far as I am aware, during the whole period which intervened between the date of the Council of Sardica and the Vandal invasion of Africa (A.D. 428), there is only one instance on record of the African hierarchy allowing the pope to carry out the Sardican discipline concerning appeals by receiving an appeal from an African tribunal and thereupon appointing African bishops to revise the judgement and sentence of that tribunal.⁵ This one instance belongs to the year 418. It seems probable that in the early part of that year, or else at the end of the preceding year, during a period of time when the relations between the Churches of Rome and Africa were very seriously strained, one or more bishops of the province of Mauritania Caesariensis appealed from the judgement of a Mauritanian synod to Pope Zosimus. That pope appears to have requested S. Augustine, S. Alypius of Tagaste, S. Possidius of Calama and some other African bishops to go to the province of Mauritania Caesariensis and there take part in the re-hearing of the case or cases in regard to which there had been an appeal to Rome. S. Augustine and his colleagues arrived at Caesarea,⁶ the civil metropolis of the province, before September 20. They had come to Mauritania from Carthage, where they had been taking part in the great council of May, 418, which dealt with the Pelagian heresy. About the date of the opening of that council, or very soon afterwards, there had arrived in Africa the welcome news that Zosimus had finally made up his mind to condemn Pelagius and Coelestius. By that condemnation the

saepe constitutum est. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam ad communionem suscipiatur."

¹ Cf. Van Espen, *Scholia in Canones Africanos, Op. Posthum*, ed. 1755, p. 322, et Ballerini. *Obs. in Dissert. v. Quesnell*, pars i. cap. vi. n. 27, *P. L.*, lv. 570.

² *Loc. cit.*

³ Eng. trans., ii. 469.

⁴ Compare what is said on this matter by Tillemont (xiii. 1037) and by Dom Coustant (*P. L.*, l. 425). Among other things Dom Coustant says that the 28th canon of the African code is so worded "ut appellationes ad transmarina non minus episcopis quam caeteris clericis prohibitas fuisse doceat."

⁵ I of course exclude from this survey the seven years during which the arrangement, which allowed African appeals to go to Rome, was in force.

⁶ Caesarea seems to correspond with the modern Cherchel, a coast town, rather more than fifty miles from Algiers, to the West.

state of tension between Rome and Africa had been brought to an end ; and the African bishops would be full of joy and gratitude, and would be anxious to oblige their Roman colleague. They seem, therefore, to have sanctioned the acceptance of Zosimus' commission by S. Augustine and the other commissioners. But they seem also to have felt it to be necessary to guard against such appeals in the future by pointing out to Zosimus that appeals of bishops from African decisions to Rome were forbidden by the African canons. When Zosimus' legate, Faustinus, arrived in Africa towards the end of the year, it appeared that the very first point mentioned in his instructions was an injunction to urge the African bishops to agree "that it should be lawful for bishops to appeal to Rome."¹ If the African bishops had always been freely appealing to Rome, such an injunction would not have occupied the place of honour in the pope's *communitorium*. There can be no doubt that Cardinal Baronius is quite right when he concludes from the wording of this first injunction that, before Zosimus sent his legates to Carthage, African bishops had appealed to him from African tribunals.² But the Cardinal ought to have pushed his conclusion a step further, and to have deduced from the language of the *communitorium* that the African hierarchy had raised objections to the principle of episcopal appeals from Africa to Rome. If no objection had been raised, why should the pope ask the African Church to agree that "it should be lawful for bishops to appeal to Rome?" There had clearly been a protest against appeals some little time before Faustinus and his fellow-legates started from Italy. For myself I am inclined to connect that protest with the Mauritanian cases which S. Augustine and his brethren were apparently commissioned to re-hear. A papal commission to African bishops strikes us, when we read about it, as something quite new in the history of the African Church ; and a request from Rome, addressed to the African hierarchy, and begging that no obstacles shall be put in the way of African bishops appealing to Rome, is also something quite new ; and when it is observed that one of these novelties follows immediately after the other, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that they are closely connected together. If the African bishops, when they allowed the papal commission to be executed, put in a protest against episcopal appeals in the future, there would be no difficulty in understanding why the papal commission was immediately followed by the papal request. To allow the pope to have his way in a particular case, while reserving the final decision, which would govern the future, seems to be a plan which the wise rulers of the African Church would be very likely to adopt. It is exactly analogous to the plan which they did in fact adopt in reference to the Sardican canons alleged by Zosimus.

There certainly is not the least reason for thinking that a papal commission addressed to African bishops represents the African ideal of the way in which episcopal appeals from African tribunals should be terminated. The real African ideal was formulated by S. Cyprian in 252, and was re-stated by S. Aurelius and his colleagues in 426.

¹ *P. L.*, xx. 754, "ut Romam liceat episcopis provocare."

² *Annal. Eccl.*, edit. 1658, ad ann. 419, tom. v. p. 463.

It was based on the principle that African disciplinary causes of all sorts and kinds should be terminated in Africa by the local hierarchy, and without any appeal to Rome. The Council of Carthage, in the year 426, writing to Pope Celestine, says, "The Nicene decrees have most plainly committed the inferior clergy *and the bishops themselves* to their metropolitans. For they have ordained, with great prudence and justice, that *all matters shall be terminated in the places where they arise.*" No wonder that that same council brought to a close the controversy on appeals by passing a canon forbidding any one in Africa to be so audacious as to appeal to Rome.¹ Mgr. Duchesne accurately describes the African discipline in the following terms:—"Pour de graves raisons l'église africaine interdisait chez elle les appels transmarins."²

It is difficult to understand how Dr. Rivington could have brought himself to say that in North Africa "the course of appeal was, in the case of bishops, first to the province, next to a general synod, *and then to Rome.*"³ The fact was that the African Church faithfully maintained the immemorial Catholic discipline, which requires that disciplinary cases should be terminated in the countries where they arise. This discipline, after being obscured in England during the later middle ages, mainly through the influence of the forged decretals and the *Decretum* of Gratian, was happily re-asserted and re-established among us in the sixteenth century. *Deo gratias.*

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON LECTURE VIII.

NOTE 69 (see p. 267). *On the theory that S. Eusebius and Lucifer were papal legates.*—Dr. Rivington's representation of what happened at Alexandria and Antioch in the summer of 362 is largely based on his theory that S. Eusebius of Vercellæ⁴ and Lucifer were papal legates during the reign of Julian the Apostate, and had been entrusted "by the Apostolic see with powers of extraordinary jurisdiction and authority in the East."⁵ As we have already seen, Stiltinck admits that the fact of this legation is nowhere asserted in clear terms by any ancient author.⁶ The Dominican, Natalis Alexander, is still more candid, and says in stronger terms that there is no trace of this

¹ Cf. Coleti, v. 780. "Ut nullus ad transmarina audeat appellare." The Ballerini (*De Antiq. Collection. et Collector. Canonum*, pars ii. cap. iii. § 9, n. 59, P. L., lvi. 121) point out the connexion between the subject of this canon and that of the synodical letter to Celestine, as indicating that they emanate from the same council.

² *Bulletin Critique* for November 25, 1895, p. 644.

³ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 297.

⁴ There is no reason to suppose that S. Eusebius ever received a commission to act as papal legate, either before the exile of Liberius or after it. Dr. Rivington seems to think that he held the office of legate in perpetuity, no matter who was pope. He speaks (*Prim. Church*, p. 216) of Eusebius as having been *Damasus'* legate. Apparently his doctrine is, Once a legate always a legate.

⁵ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 194.

⁶ See p. 267, n. 1.

asserted legation in the works of the ecclesiastical writers.¹ Dr. Rivington seems to rely in proof of his theory very largely on what he calls "The Archives of Vercelli," by which term he means a certain manuscript *Vita S. Eusebii*, preserved in the chapter-library of the cathedral at Vercelli.² He informs us that this *Vita* was "published under the authority" of S. Eusebius' "successor, S. Honoratus."³

Now, it is to be observed that all Dr. Rivington's quotations from the *Vita* are also quoted in Van Papenbroeck's *Life of Lucifer* in the fifth volume of the Bollandist *May*, a *Life* which Dr. Rivington has consulted, and to which he several times refers. It seems to me to be probable that Dr. Rivington's knowledge of the *Vita* is mainly if not entirely derived from Van Papenbroeck. I certainly see no indications which would lead me to suppose that Dr. Rivington has ever had the opportunity of studying the *Vita S. Eusebii* as a whole, either in its manuscript form at Vercelli, or in Corbellini's edition, copies of which are very rare. In any case, he nowhere attempts to discuss the antiquity and trustworthiness of the *Vita*, or to prove its alleged connexion with S. Honoratus. It would therefore have been better if he had informed his readers that Van Papenbroeck confesses that he does not regard the *Vita* as being a very ancient biography,⁴ and that he doubts its connexion with S. Honoratus.⁵ Stiltinck, who does all in his power to prop up the theory that S. Eusebius and Lucifer were papal legates, very significantly and, one must add, very prudently refrains from making any allusion to the *Vita* when he is discussing the question of the legation.⁶ Father Victor de Buck, a recent President of the Bollandists, and a man who was chosen out of the whole Jesuit order to be the theologian of the General at the Vatican Council, makes no reference to the *Vita* in his *Life of S. Honoratus*;⁷ although he must have done so, if he had believed in its trustworthiness, antiquity, and connexion with the Saint whose *Life* he was writing.⁸ Under such

¹ Natal. Alexandr. *Hist. Eccl.*, saec. quart., cap. iii. art. xiii., edit. Bing. ad Rhen., 1787, tom. vii. p. 115.

² See Rivington's *Appeal to History*, pp. 12, 13. Compare *Prim. Church*, pp. 195, 201.

³ *Prim. Ch.*, p. 195, n. 1.

⁴ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. v. Mai., p. 198*.

⁵ Cf. *Op. cit.*, p. 205*.

⁶ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. vi. Septembr., pp. 618-620.

⁷ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. xii. Octobr., pp. 577-582. It should be specially noted that Father de Buck makes no allusion to the legend that S. Honoratus was concerned in the composition and publication of the *Vita*, even in the paragraph on p. 581 which is headed, "Plura minus certa traduntur de S. Honorato." He evidently regarded the legend as being absolutely apocryphal.

⁸ I cannot pass on, after mentioning Father Victor de Buck's name, without recalling with gratitude the kindness and courtesy with which he received me more than thirty years ago, and showed me some of the treasures preserved in the library of his illustrious house, and gave me more hours of his most interesting conversation than I like to recall. The whole of Christendom owes a debt to the Bollandist Fathers, not only for the thoroughness of their investigations, but for their candour. Of course there have been exceptions, such as Stiltinck; but I speak of the general spirit of their work, and pre-eminently of the more recent volumes. When one is turning over the leaves of those volumes, one is inclined to say, *O si*

circumstances I hope that I shall not be regarded as failing in my duty if I simply take no account of these so-called "Archives of Vercelli," at any rate until Roman Catholics shall have made some serious attempt to demonstrate their trustworthiness.

If we set aside the evidence of the *Vita*, the Ultramontane argument in favour of S. Eusebius and Lucifer having been papal legates in the year 362 may be summed up in Dr. Rivington's assertion that that theory "explains a great deal that would otherwise, even on Mr. Puller's principles, be altogether mysterious," and that "apart from this, the Council [of Alexandria] would have acted in a way not justified on either Anglican or Roman principles."¹

In reply to this it is sufficient to say that, quite apart from the presence of any papal legates, the action of S. Athanasius and his colleagues at Alexandria admirably illustrates Anglican principles, and causes no serious difficulty to the more moderate Romanists. It, no doubt, does cause difficulty to Dr. Rivington and to the more extreme Ultramontanes. But such persons cannot be allowed to invent papal legations in order to extricate themselves from the hopeless position, in which they find themselves, when they attempt to explain the actions of primitive bishops by their own very inadequate views of the powers and rights of the episcopate. It is one of the fundamental principles on which our English canonists lay great stress, that, when grave necessity urges, the by-laws of the Church, which normally hinder bishops from acting outside the ordinary sphere of their jurisdiction, are *ipso facto* suspended, and full scope is given for the exercise of the ecumenical and Apostolic authority which a bishop receives when he becomes a successor of the Apostles at his consecration.² It is astonishing to me that Dr. Rivington should not have been aware that this principle is defended with great skill and erudition by our more learned writers, and that it is also maintained by many famous canonists of his own communion. And even among those Roman Catholic canonists who are more papally inclined, there are some who are sufficiently prudent to avoid inventing

sic omnes! How many weary hours one would be spared! How many needless pages might remain unwritten! How, even though controversy might still be a necessity, one would rise up from it, attracted to one's antagonists instead of being repelled, if only the Bollandist spirit could become prevalent among all those who have to write on the history of the Church, and who have to deal with the questions which separate the communions into which for the present it is divided!

¹ *The Appeal to History*, pp. 12, 13.

² So S. Eusebius of Samosata, when the Arian persecution under Valens had been brought to an end by that Emperor's death in 378, returned from exile, and consecrated bishops not only in the province of Euphratensis, to which his own see belonged, but also in the province of Syria Prima (see Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 4). In such a terrible crisis as that of the year 362, Lucifer would normally have been perfectly justified in consecrating Catholic bishops where they were needed. But he knew very well that a council of Catholic confessors was being held at Alexandria to determine what should be done with bishops tainted in some way with Arianism, but not really Arians at heart; and he knew that the case of Antioch was going to be specially considered. Under such circumstances he sinned very grievously by taking the matter into his own hands; and it is no wonder that from a confessor he became a schismatic, and died in that miserable condition.

papal legations as a means of explaining the line of action adopted by primitive bishops when they felt themselves to be justified in stepping beyond the limits of their diocese or province or patriarchate. Such canonists explain the action of those bishops by the principle that “*dum exposcit necessitas, charitas nullos patitur limites, et ubique potest immo debet fidelibus ac fidei periclitanti opitulari.*”¹ These are the words of the learned Ultramontane, Mansi, in an *Animadversio*, the whole of which may be commended to the study of those who are inclined to accept Dr. Rivington’s statements.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LECTURE IX.

NOTE 70 (see note 3 on pp. 292, 293). *On the “Refutatio Hypocrisis Meletii.”*—In the course of his attack on S. Meletius, Dr. Rivington appeals to a quibbling document, commonly known as the *Refutatio hypocrisis Meletii*, as showing “the feeling that was entertained by some of the orthodox party as to the line which Meletius adopted.”² It is much to be regretted that the writer, named above, should have appealed, in support of his own attack on our Saint, to such a production as the *Refutatio*. It may be worth while for the reader to note what is said of it by three great scholars belonging to the Roman communion.

Montfaucon, after showing in a convincing way the impossibility of attributing the authorship of the *Refutatio* to S. Athanasius,³ says:—“Moreover, it would be unworthy of S. Athanasius to attack orthodox and pious decisions [namely, those of S. Meletius and his colleagues] by quibbles and cavils (*argutiis atque cavillis*), which is the only thing which our author does.”⁴ On the same page Montfaucon says that it is “probable enough” (*veri satis simile*) that the author of the *Refutatio* was “Paulinus” or one of his followers.”

Dom Maran in his *Dissertation sur les Semi-Ariens* says that the author of the *Refutatio*, “*était un esprit échauffé du parti de Paulin.*”⁵

Dom Toutté says, “Observe, moreover, what an unbounded license of calumniating their adversaries held sway among the partisans of Paulinus. One example of this temper is sufficient; I allude to their treatment of Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata. For when in the Council of Antioch of the year 363 those bishops had by a solemn decree embraced the dogma of the *ὁμοούσιον*, there was actually found a man who, in an impudent writing, entitled the *Confutatio hypocrisis Eusebii et Meletii*, denied that those bishops expressed their real mind and opinion when they gave their assent to the Nicene creed.”⁶

¹ Natal. Alexandr. *Hist. Eccl.*, sæc. prim., animadversiones post dissert. iv., edit. Bing. ad Rhen., tom. iv. p. 269.

² *The Appeal to History*, p. 18.

³ The *Refutatio* had been ascribed to S. Athanasius in an uncritical age.

⁴ *Admonit. in Refut.*, S. Athan. *Opp.*, edit. Ben., 1777, ii. 23.

⁵ *Bibliothec. Historiæ Haeresiologicae*, edit. J. Vogt, Hamburg, 1729, ii. 133.

⁶ *Dissert. i. de Vita S. Cyrilli*, cap. v. § 29, S. Cyrill. Hierosol. *Opp.*, edit. Ben., col. xxiv.

NOTE 71 (see note 1 on p. 293). *On the attitude of S. Athanasius towards the Antiochene Council of 363.*—The question of S. Athanasius' attitude of mind towards the letter of the Antiochene Council of 363 to Jovian is worth considering. He had just been refused communion by S. Meletius probably on the ground of his communion with Marcellus, and he was preparing to enter into communion with Paulinus, S. Meletius' rival, or perhaps he had already admitted that rival to his fellowship. The situation was one which would tend to make him view the proceedings of the Council of Antioch with suspicion. Dr. Robertson says, "We can well imagine that it was with mixed feelings that Athanasius saw a number of bishops assemble under Meletius to sign the Nicene Creed. To begin with, they explained the *ὁμοούσιον* to be equivalent to *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* and *ἕμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν*. Now, this was no more than taking Athanasius literally at his word (*de Syn.* 41 exactly; the confession, Socr. iii. 25, appears to meet Ath. *de Syn.* half way: cf. the reference to *Ἑλληνικὴ χρῆσις* with *de Syn.* 51), and there is no reason to doubt that the majority of those who signed did so in all sincerity, merely guarding the *ὁμοούσιον* against its Sabellian sense (which Hilary, *de Syn.* 71, had admitted as possible), and in fact meaning by the term exactly what Basil the Great and his school meant by it. This is confirmed by the express denunciation of Arianism and Anomoeanism. But Athanasius may have suspected an intention on the part of some signatories to evade the full sense of the creed, especially as touching the Holy Spirit, and this suspicion would not be lessened by the fact that Acacius signed with the rest. It must remain possible, therefore, that a clause in the letter to Jovian, referred to above, expresses his displeasure at the wording of the document."¹ The clause to which Dr. Robertson refers runs thus, "But since now certain, who wish to renew the Arian heresy, have presumed to set at naught this faith confessed at Nicaea by the Fathers, and, while making a show of confessing it, do in fact deny it, misinterpreting the *ὁμοούσιον*, and blaspheming of their own accord against the Holy Ghost, in that they affirm that It (*αὐτό*) is a creature, and came into being as a thing made by the Son, we hasten, as of bounden duty, in view of the injury resulting to the people from such blasphemy, to give into the hands of your Piety the faith confessed at Nicaea."²

I must say that, after a fuller study of these words of S. Athanasius, I am less inclined than I was at first to accept the theory that he is attacking the synodical letter of the Antiochene Council of 363. There is not a word in that letter about the Holy Ghost except the sentence of the Nicene creed, which expresses the faith of the Church in regard to the Third Person. It follows that, in what S. Athanasius says about the blasphemy on the subject of the Holy Ghost, with which he charges those whom he is condemning, he cannot possibly be alluding to the Antiochene letter. He must have in view some other document.³ That

¹ Robertson, *Prolegomena*, chap. ii. § 9, p. lxi.

² S. Athan. *Ep. ad Jovianum*, § 1, *Opp.*, edit. Ben., i. 623.

³ Perhaps after the Synod of Antioch was over some of the less orthodox bishops, who had taken part in it, may have published a statement explaining their participation in the proceedings of the council in such a way as to commit

leaves it open to us to suppose that, in what he says about misinterpretation of the *ῥημοῦσιον*, he is criticizing that same evil document, whatever it was, and not S. Meletius' synodical letter. Moreover, I should be loth to imagine that, under whatever irritation, S. Athanasius could possibly have denounced in such terms as those which he uses in his letter to Jovian, an interpretation of the *ῥημοῦσιον* which was palpably taken from his own *Epistle on the Synods*, written four years before.

If any one should take the view suggested as possible, though not affirmed, by Dr. Robertson in the passage quoted earlier in this note, it would have to be remembered that in 372 S. Athanasius let S. Basil know that he was most anxious to be brought into communion with S. Meletius, if only S. Meletius would open negotiations.¹ Such an expression of desire implies that, whatever he may have thought in 363, he was convinced in 372 of S. Meletius' orthodoxy.

NOTE 72 (see p. 297). *On the possible contents of the letter brought from the West in 366 by Silvanus of Tarsus.*—With our present knowledge it is not in our power to say with any certainty what was contained in the letter brought from the West by Silvanus of Tarsus.² But I would call to mind certain facts which may suggest what may possibly have been its subject. There were at the time of the visit of the Eastern deputies to Rome several Eastern churches, in which two bishops, who had, either in the East or West or both, a reputation for orthodoxy, were rival claimants of the episcopal throne. At Antioch there were S. Meletius and Paulinus. At Ancyra there were Marcellus and Athanasius. At Tyre there were Zeno and Diodorus. At Laodicea in Syria there were Apollinarius, not yet generally recognized as a heretic, and S. Pelagius. Probably after all the confusions of the previous thirty years there were other cases resembling these. The Eastern deputies may have consulted Liberius or some other prominent Western bishop or some Western synod as to what should be done in such cases. And a written reply may have been given, suggesting that in cities where such a difficulty had to be met, the lesser body should be absorbed into the larger body, and that some arrangement should be made which would secure a place of honour for the bishop of the minority, who would have to give place. An arrangement in some ways resembling this had been suggested by the Council of Nicaea in its eighth canon, and also in its synodical epistle to the Church of Alexandria.

themselves to the heresy of the Pneumatomachi, and to a misinterpretation of the *ῥημοῦσιον*. Or, since there were, besides the Council of Antioch, a large number of other synods held throughout the East during the year 363, of whose proceedings we possess no records, it may very well be that one or other of them may have accepted the creed of the Emperor, giving, however, to it an interpretation conformable to the Pneumatomachian ideas which were spreading in the East; and that it was to such a synod as this that S. Athanasius referred in his letter to Jovian. Or, finally, he may be referring to some document, drawn up by heterodox persons, of a somewhat earlier date. Already in the Tome of the Council of Alexandria (§ 3), S. Athanasius had said, "Those who, while pretending to applaud the faith confessed at Nicaea, venture to blaspheme the Holy Ghost, do nothing more than in words deny the Arian heresy, while they retain it in thought."

¹ See p. 290.

² Cf. S. Basil. *Ep.* lxxvii. *ad Athanasium*, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., iii. 160.

If the letter brought by Silvanus of Tarsus contained a proposal of this kind, it would be natural for S. Basil to appeal to it, as favouring the policy which he wished S. Athanasius to adopt with regard to Antioch.¹

NOTE 73 (see p. 316). *On the collections in which the rubric with the clause "ad petitum Hieronymi" is found.*—The juxtaposition of the two letters *Quoniam vestito Oriens*² and *Per filium meum*,³ and the prefixing of the rubric with the clause "ad petitum Hieronymi" as a heading to the second of these two letters occur in the following collections of canons and of other documents relating to ecclesiastical law.

1. THE FREISINGEN COLLECTION, which in its completed form cannot be earlier than the closing years of the fifth century, but which may probably have been in gradual process of formation during the course of that century. The latest documents contained in it appear to be certain letters of Pope Gelasius (A.D. 492-496). This collection is to be found in a manuscript now at Munich (Cod. lat. Monac. 6243, olim Cod. Fris. 43). See Maassen (*Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, pp. 476, 482). The collection is probably of Roman origin. I have examined the *codex* containing the collection, and am able to say that the rubric with the words "ad petitum Hieronymi" occurs on fol. 42 b.

2. The collection known as THE ENLARGED HADRIANA, which in its completed form cannot be earlier than the middle of the eighth century. The latest document contained in it appears to be the *Acta* of the Roman Council of the year 743, under Pope Zacharias. This collection is to be found in four manuscripts, viz. Cod. lat. Monac. 14008; Cod. Vallicell. A. 5; Cod. Vercell. lxxvi.; and Cod. Vatic. 1353. See Maassen (*Op. cit.*, pp. 454, 457). In Cod. Vallicell. A. 5, which I have examined, the rubric with the clause "ad petitum Hieronymi" occurs on fol. 234 a.

3. THE SESSORIAN COLLECTION, by which name I venture to designate the collection contained in Cod. National. Vict. Emman. 2102 (olim Cod. Sessor. lxxiii.), a manuscript now in the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emmanuele at Rome. This collection is, in fact, an enlarged *Hadriana*, and it contains much in common with the collection which is commonly called by that title. These two collections must have been

¹ The argument of this Additional Note will be made clearer if I quote the latter portion of the epistle of S. Basil to S. Athanasius, to which I am referring (*Ep. lxxvii.*, S. Basil. *Opp.*, iii. 160). S. Basil is speaking of S. Meletius, and he says, "He is a man of unimpeachable faith; his manner of life is incomparably excellent; he stands at the head, so to say, of the whole body of the Church, and all else are mere disjointed members. On every ground, then, it is necessary as well as advantageous that the rest should be united with him, just as smaller streams are united with great ones. About the rest [*i.e.* the Eustathians], however, it will be needful to make some special arrangement (*τινὰ διοικουσαν*), befitting their position, and likely to pacify the people, and in keeping with your own wisdom and with your famous readiness and energy. It has, however, by no means escaped your unsurpassable acuteness, that these same suggestions have already recommended themselves to the Westerns, who are in agreement with you, as is clear from the letter (or letters) brought to us by Silvanus of blessed memory."

² S. Hieron. *Ep. xv. ad Damasum*, P. L., xxii. 355-358.

³ Damas. *Ep. iii. ad Paulinum*, P. L., xlii. 356, 357.

compiled at about the same time. I have examined the Sessorian manuscript, and am able to say that the rubric with the clause "ad petitum Hieronymi" occurs on fol. 209 b.

4. THE DIESSEN COLLECTION, or rather the appendix to that collection. The original collection was compiled in the course of the seventh century. The documents in the appendix have been copied from the Freisingen Collection (see Maassen, *Op. cit.*, pp. 631, 632). The collection with its appendix is to be found in Cod. lat. Monac. 5508 (olim Diess. 8). See Maassen (*Op. cit.*, p. 624).

5. THE COLLECTION OF THE COD. LAT. MONAC. 3860^a (olim Cod. Aug. Eccl. 160^a). This collection has a considerable similarity to the Sessorian Collection and to the Enlarged Hadriana, as will be seen by referring to Maassen (*Op. cit.*, pp. 32, 51, 307, 351, 354, 394, 400, 402, 406, 955). But there are some documents in this collection which are absent from one or both of the other two. The latest document contained in it which is mentioned by Maassen, so far as I have observed, is an epitome of a Roman Council of the year 826 (see Maassen, *Op. cit.*, p. 308). A table of its contents is given in the *Catalogus Codicum Latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis* (tom. i. pars ii., p. 126). From that catalogue I learn that on fol. 191 of the MS. is S. Jerome's letter to Damasus, that is to say, the letter *Quoniam vetusto Oriens*. Immediately after the entry of this letter in the table of contents is the following entry: "fol. 192—Rescriptum Damasi papae ad petitum Hieronymi ad Paulinum episc. Antiochiae." This entry bears witness to the clause "ad petitum Hieronymi," and assuredly implies the presence of the rubric, to which attention has been previously called. There is a catalogue of the popes in this collection, and the original scribe finishes with Nicholas I., who died in 867. See Maassen (*Op. cit.*, p. 406).

6. THE ENLARGED DIONYSIANA OF BOBBIO. This collection is found in two manuscripts, viz. Cod. Ambros. S. 33 sup. and Cod. Vercell. cxi. See Maassen (*Op. cit.*, p. 471). The latest document contained in it¹ is the epitome of the Roman council of the year 826 (see Maassen, *Op. cit.*, pp. 308, 475, 476). I have ascertained, through the very great kindness of Mgr. Ceriani, to whom I applied through my friend, the Rev. H. J. White of Merton College, that in the Ambrosian *codex* the rubric with the clause "ad petitum Hieronymi" occurs on fol. 153a. It is preceded by S. Jerome's letter (*Quoniam vetusto*) and is followed by the rescript of Damasus (*Per filium meum*).² The manuscript was written in the ninth century.

¹ The contents of the Ambrosian manuscript, in which this collection is found, are given by Amadeus Peyron, in his edition of the Inventory of the books of the monastery of S. Columbanus of Bobbio (pp. 137-155). This edition of the Inventory is prefixed to Peyron's *Fragmenta Inedita Ciceronis Orationum* (edit. 1824, Stuttgartiae et Tubingae).

² It is, perhaps, worth noticing that in this Ambrosian *codex*, and also in the Freisingen Collection, and in the Vallicellan *codex* of the *Enlarged Hadriana*, and in the Sessorian *Codex*, the first words of Damasus' rescript are, "Et per ipsum filium meum." About the reading of this passage in the other manuscripts here mentioned, I have no information.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LECTURE X.

NOTE 74 (see p. 342). *On the date of S. Gregory Nazianzen's 22nd Oration.*—As Merenda has tried to show¹ from a passage in S. Gregory Nazianzen's twenty-second Oration, that that Father regarded the compact between S. Meletius and Paulinus as having been thoroughly concluded and ratified, so as to be binding on the episcopate generally, I propose to investigate in this note the date of that Oration and the meaning of the passage on which Merenda bases his argument.

Merenda thinks that the Oration was delivered during the sitting of the Second Ecumenical Council. But the second chapter of the Oration² makes it clear that it was delivered during the Gothic war. It follows that, as it was certainly delivered in Constantinople, it must belong either to the year 379 or to the year 380, and cannot belong to the year 381.³ For the Gothic war was brought for a time to a conclusion in the summer of 380,⁴ and there is not the smallest trace, so far as I am aware, of its breaking out again so early as 381. In harmony with this conclusion, we find that in the eighth chapter of the Oration⁵ S. Gregory implies that the churches of Constantinople were, at the time of the delivery of the Oration, occupied by the Arians. As the Arian occupation of the Constantinopolitan churches came to an end in November, 380,⁶ the Oration must have been delivered before that date. In the thirteenth chapter⁷ S. Gregory says that those whom he is addressing have such a superabundance of factiousness, that they lend it to the rivalries of others, and undertake private enmities on behalf of alien thrones; and in the sixteenth chapter he says that he will not add to what he has already observed any harsh remarks, "for it is a law that fathers should spare their children."⁸ He is obviously not addressing the bishops at the Ecumenical Council, who had, many of them, been bishops much longer than himself; but he is speaking to his children, that is to say, to his own flock in his beloved church of the Resurrection, who, at the time when the Oration was delivered, were divided into parties, sympathizing with one or other of the two claimants of the throne of distant Antioch. S. Gregory alludes to these party divisions, which seem to have broken out soon after his arrival in Constantinople, in his *Carmen de Vita sua* (vv. 679–683).⁹ The Benedictine editors, in their note to that passage, point out that under the names of "Paul" and "Apollos" S. Gregory is really referring to S. Meletius and Paulinus. S. Gregory's words imply that the Constantinopolitan partisans of both "Paul" and "Apollos" were orthodox Christians belonging to the congregation which met at the church of the Resurrection and recognized S. Gregory as its pastor. So that in 379, or possibly, though less probably, in 380, there was good

¹ *De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gestt.*, cap. xiv. § 1 et cap. xviii. § 2, P. L., xiii. 190, 221.

² S. Greg. Naz. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 415.

³ S. Gregory lived at Constantinople from the early part of 379 to July, 381.

⁴ See p. 331.

⁵ S. Greg. Naz. *Opp.*, i. 419.

⁶ See p. 336.

⁷ *Opp.*, i. 422.

⁸ *Opp.*, i. 425.

⁹ S. Greg. Naz. *Opp.*, ii. 710.

reason for the saint to urge his flock to put away factious party-spirit in some such an exhortation as we find in the twenty-second Oration.¹

Any one who reads carefully the opening sentences of the Oration will see that the compact or covenant, of which S. Gregory fears the violation, is nothing else than the mutual invocation of peace, by which the preacher and the people saluted each other before the sermon began. S. Gregory had said, "Peace be to all," and the response had been made, "And to thy spirit." Then the sermon commenced as follows: "Dear peace! sweet in experience and sweet in name, which just now I gave to the people, and in turn received back from them. I am not certain whether the utterance of all was sincere and worthy of the Spirit; or whether a public covenant² [of peace] is not being violated under the eyes of God the Witness, so that we fall into a more grievous condemnation."³

S. Gregory's words may be illustrated by a passage from a homily preached in the same city of Constantinople nineteen or twenty years later by S. Chrysostom. The preacher is commenting on Col. i. 20, and he says, "When he who presides over the church cometh in, he straightway says, 'Peace be to all;' when he preacheth, he says, 'Peace be to all;' when he blesseth, he says, 'Peace be to all;' when he biddeth to the kiss of peace, he says, 'Peace be to all;' when the Sacrifice is finished, he says, 'Peace be to all.' And again, in the middle, he says, 'Grace be to you and peace.' How then is it not monstrous if, while hearing so many times that we have peace, we are in a state of war with each other; and receiving peace and giving it back, are at war with him [the bishop] who giveth it to us? *Thou sayest, 'And to thy spirit;'* and dost thou slander him abroad? Woe is me! that the majestic usages of the Church are become forms of things merely, and not a reality."⁴

NOTE 75 (see p. 350). *Corroborations of the conclusion that S. Meletius died out of communion with Rome.*—There is a remarkable passage in a letter of Pope S. Boniface I., addressed to Rufus of Thessalonica and to other bishops of Eastern Illyricum, which very notably confirms the conclusion that S. Meletius died out of communion with Rome. The pope is giving instances of Eastern bishops seeking help from Rome. He naturally writes from a Western or rather from a Roman point of view. He says, "When the Church of Antioch was for a long while in a state of distress, so that on account of this trouble journeys from thence were often undertaken, first under Meletius and afterwards under Flavian, it is manifest that the apostolic see was consulted. And every one knows that, after many things had been transacted by our Church, Flavian

¹ Mgr. Batiffol (*Littérature Grecque*, p. 238) says that the *Orations* xx. to xxv. belong to the year 379. Rauschen (*Fahrbücher*, p. 53) also assigns *Orat.* xxii. to 379. So also do Tillemont and the Benedictines. If it were worth while, it would not be difficult to point out other passages in the Oration, which make it impossible to accept Merenda's theory that it was delivered in the presence of the Second Ecumenical Council.

² Merenda's theory is based on the notion that the "covenant" to which S. Gregory here refers is the compact between S. Meletius and Paulinus.

³ S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxii. cap. 1, *Opp.*, i. 414.

⁴ S. Chrys. *Hom.* iii. in *Epist. ad Coloss.*, § 3, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., xi. 348.

received by the authority of the said apostolic see the grace of communion, which grace he would never have obtained if letters of communion (super hoc scripta) had not issued from this place."¹ Here the state of distress which afflicted the Church of Antioch is represented as continuing during the occupancy of the see by S. Meletius and by S. Flavian, and as being at last brought to an end by the admission of S. Flavian to the communion of the Roman Church. Not a word is said about any reconciliation of S. Meletius with Rome, and in fact the passage implies that S. Boniface knew of no such event having taken place.

Reference may also be made to some lines in S. Gregory Nazianzen's *Carmen de Vita sua*. The saint is describing the dispute in the Ecumenical Council as to the succession to the see of Antioch after S. Meletius' death. He gives in verse the subject of the speech which he made, counselling that Paulinus should be left undisturbed. In this speech the following passage occurs: "As long as the divine bishop [Meletius] was in the midst, and it was not clear how ever they of the West would receive the man (τὸν ἄνδρα δέξοντ'), for hitherto they had been wroth, it was in a way pardonable to grieve somewhat the defenders of the canons, as they call themselves"² (τοὺς, ὡς λέγουσι, τῶν νόμων ἀμύνητορας). The defenders of the canons are, of course, Damasus and the Western bishops, who so styled themselves. Merenda points out that the meaning of δέξοντ' in this passage is to receive into communion. He says, "Norunt vero omnes, quae sit ecclesiastico stylo perpetua hujus verbi vis. Hinc δεκτοί, qui communionis jure utuntur, quibus ἄδεκτοι oppositi sunt. Vid. Can. Ap. 13, ac Suicerum. Vide etiam epistolam Julii ad Orientales n. 13."³ S. Gregory seems clearly to imply that the breach of communion with the West continued during S. Meletius' life; but on his death Paulinus, who was in communion with the West, was left sole bishop (μονόθρονος, cf. 1586); and S. Gregory is anxious that the restoration of peace between the Churches of Rome and Antioch should not be prevented by the election of a successor to S. Meletius.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LECTURE XI.

NOTE 76 (see note 2 on p. 364). *On the calumnious legend, attributing perjury to S. Flavian.*—It would not be right to give expression to a favourable judgement about S. Flavian's qualifications for the episcopate, if it were possible to accept as true a story, which finds a place in the pages of Socrates,⁴ and which has been taken over from him by Sozomen.⁵ According to that story, at the time when S. Meletius and Paulinus made their compact, six of the clergy of Antioch, who seemed to have the best chance of being elected to the bishopric whenever the see should be vacant, solemnly swore that they would neither come

¹ S. Bonif. *Ep.* xv. § 6, *P. L.*, xx. 782, 783. This letter was probably written in the year 422.

² S. Greg. Naz. *Carmen de Vita sua*, 1611–1615, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 758.

³ *De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gestt.*, cap. xviii. § 4, n. c, *P. L.*, xiii. 221, 222.

⁴ Cf. Socrat. *H. E.*, v. 5.

⁵ Cf. Sozom. *H. E.*, vii. 3.

forward as candidates nor accept the episcopate¹ so long as either Meletius or Paulinus remained alive, but would leave the survivor in possession of the see. Moreover, Socrates and his copyist, Sozomen, assure us that one of the six who publicly bound themselves by this oath was Flavian. The story seems to me to be quite incredible. It is rejected by the Bollandists,² and it is regarded by Tillemont as not well authenticated and as a tale which it is not easy to believe.³ If it were true, then S. Flavian owed his episcopal dignity to flagrant perjury; and surely, if that had been the case, he could never have been venerated in the way he was by a man like S. Chrysostom, who was ordained in Antioch to the diaconate just at the time when the oath was supposed to have been taken. S. Chrysostom was at that time thirty-seven years old, and he must have known of the incident of the oath, if it really took place. Moreover, if S. Flavian had been guilty of perjury when he accepted the bishopric, he could never have been enrolled in the catalogue of the saints; for he retained his see until his death, and therefore never made satisfaction for his abominable crime. And again, how is it that S. Gregory Nazianzen, who argued so earnestly against electing any successor to S. Meletius during the lifetime of Paulinus, and who has preserved for us the substance of what he said on that point, never alludes to this alleged oath-taking?⁴ And why does S. Ambrose, who wrote against S. Flavian's claim, make no reference to the perjury which had accompanied his consecration?⁵ But above all, how is it possible to conceive that the diocese, province, and patriarchate of Antioch, and the whole episcopate of the East, gathered in the Second Ecumenical Council, could have made themselves parties to this atrociously wicked act? And finally, how could the Fathers, who met at Constantinople in the year 382, have had the audacity to write, in their letter to Damasus and to the other Western bishops, that the episcopate of the province and patriarchate of Antioch had "canonically consecrated the most reverend and most God-beloved Bishop Flavian"?⁶ Dr. Rivington no doubt ventures to say that "it is to be feared" that Flavian "had promised [why not *sworn*?] not to accept the bishopric."⁷ But he can only support his suggestion by charging half the Church, as well as saints like S. Chrysostom, with the crime of condoning and

¹ Van den Bosche is, I think, mistaken when he argues (*Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Jul., p. 60) that Socrates differs from Sozomen in that he does not represent the six clergymen as binding themselves to refuse the bishopric if it should be offered to them, but describes their action as limited to the taking of an oath to refrain from using any personal efforts to secure their election. On the contrary, Socrates expressly says that they swore to allow whichever of the two bishops should survive the other to retain undisturbed possession of the see. There is no real difference between Socrates' story and Sozomen's. Only the latter states explicitly what the former clearly implies. I gather from Merenda's statement (*De S. Damasi Opuscul. et Gestit.*, cap. xiv. § 1, *P. L.*, xiii. 190) that he would agree with me on this point, as against Van den Bosche.

² Cf. *Acta SS.*, loc. cit.

³ Cf. Tillemont, x. 527, and see viii. 371.

⁴ Cf. S. Greg. Naz. *Carmen de Vita sua*, 1591-1679, *Opp.*, ii. 758-762.

⁵ Cf. S. Ambros. *Ep.* lvi. *ad Theophilum*, *P. L.*, xvi. 1220-1222.

⁶ Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 9.

⁷ *Prim. Church*, p. 253.

supporting perjury. Ultramontane controversialists may be ready to take upon themselves the responsibility of making such an accusation, but no one can wonder that more prudent historians of their communion, such as the Bollandists, shrink from such a course. The story narrated by Socrates and Sozomen was probably one of the many calumnies invented by the Eustathians.¹ They were quite capable of it,² and they had an interest in running down S. Flavian.

NOTE 77 (see note 3 on p. 364). *On the place and date of S. Flavian's consecration.*—In this note I intend to discuss the place and date of S. Flavian's consecration. It should be observed that the Constantinopolitan Council of 382, in its synodical letter to the Western bishops, says that Nectarius was consecrated "in the presence of the Ecumenical Council;" but in the next sentence, when it describes the consecration of S. Flavian, it makes no allusion to the ceremony having been performed in the presence of the Ecumenical Council. What it tells us is that "over the most ancient and truly apostolical Church in Antioch of Syria . . . the bishops of the province and of the Eastern diocese [*i.e.* patriarchate], having come together, canonically consecrated the most reverend and most God-beloved Bishop Flavian, the whole Church [of Antioch] assenting and as it were with one voice honouring the man."³ In this passage we are undoubtedly given to understand that the consent of the Church of Antioch was obtained before S. Flavian was consecrated. And it will follow that, on the hypothesis that S. Flavian was elected and afterwards consecrated by the bishops of the *Oriens*, when they were in Constantinople for the Ecumenical Council, we must allow an interval of at least seven weeks to intervene between the election and the consecration, in order that letters might be sent to Antioch, and an assembly of the Church of Antioch might be held to confirm the election, and the confirmatory decree of that assembly might be communicated to the bishops in Constantinople. But, when it is remembered that after the death of S. Meletius, which perhaps did not take place till June, some time must be allowed for the heated discussions in Constantinople (described by S. Gregory Nazianzen) as to whether any successor to S. Meletius should be appointed, it may well be doubted whether it would be possible for the replies from Antioch to reach Constantinople before the close of the Ecumenical Council,—an event which certainly took place in July. This result seems to militate against the hypothesis of a consecration at Constantinople during the sitting of the council, and it absolutely precludes the idea that S. Flavian's consecration preceded that of Nectarius. And I am bound to say that the expressions used in the synodical letter of the council of 382 seem to

¹ Socrates makes extraordinary blunders about the history of the Church of Antioch, and appears to be prejudiced in favour of the Eustathians. For example, he says (*H. E.*, vi. 3) that after the death of S. Meletius, S. Chrysostom separated himself from the Meletians, and afterwards was ordained priest by Evagrius, the successor of Paulinus! Fortunately, we have S. Chrysostom's sermons, which prove his devotion to S. Flavian, by whom he was ordained to the priesthood.

² See p. 327, and note 1 on p. 363, and Additional Note 70 (p. 496).

³ Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 9.

me to imply very clearly that S. Flavian was consecrated in the presence of the Church of Antioch, and, if so, certainly not until August or September, 381.¹ When the Fathers of the council of 382 add that "the general body of the synod (τὸ τῆς συνόδου κοινόν) approved this legitimate consecration," they may be referring either to the approbation of the Ecumenical Council given several weeks before the consecration, or to the recognition granted to S. Flavian, as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, by the council of 382.

NOTE 78 (see note 1 on p. 368). *On the date of the preaching of S. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians.*—Tillemont, in his *Life of S. Chrysostom*, expresses the opinion² that that Father's Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians were preached before the year 392; and Newman, in the Preface to the Oxford translation of those Homilies (p. x.), comes to a similar conclusion. In the first two editions of this book I accepted this result without sufficient consideration. As a matter of fact, both Tillemont and Newman elsewhere rectify this date. The former suggests reasons for assigning the Homilies to the year 395;³ and the latter, in a note on the tenth Homily, follows Tillemont's later suggestion.⁴ I am inclined now to think that this later date is right. The mention of wars and earthquakes in the last paragraph of the sixth Homily, seems to point to 395. During the whole of the autumn of 394 various regions of Europe had been shaken by earthquakes;⁵ and in the spring of 395 the Huns were laying waste the provinces of the upper valley of the Euphrates, and actually approached Antioch, so as to be within view of the walls; and Alaric with his Visigoths was ravaging Greece.⁶

NOTE 79 (see note 2 on p. 368). *On the date of Evagrius' death, and on the question whether in 395 he was in communion with Rome.*—It is commonly said that Evagrius died in 392 or 393, but the argument in favour of so early a date is not very convincing. It seems to rest entirely on the words of Socrates and of his imitator, Sozomen.⁷ Paulinus, as we have seen, died in 389, and Socrates tells us that Evagrius "did not live on for a long time"⁸ after his consecration. Sozomen

¹ It is out of the question to suppose that the bishops of the province and patriarchate of Antioch absented themselves for seven weeks from Constantinople during the sitting of the Ecumenical Council, in order that they might repair to Antioch for the election and consecration of S. Flavian. The conclusion expressed in the text, that S. Flavian was consecrated at Antioch in August or September, agrees with the view taken by Tillemont (x. 528).

² Tillemont, xi. 375.

³ *Ibid.*, xi. 629.

⁴ See the Oxford translation of S. Chrysostom on the Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians, edit. 1879, p. 220, note.

⁵ Cf. Marcellin. Comit. *Chronic.*, P. L., li. 920.

⁶ See Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, edit. 1892, vol. i. part 2, p. 654.

⁷ When I speak of Sozomen as an "imitator" of Socrates, I do not for a moment wish to suggest that there are not many passages in his history in which he takes an independent line, and gives us information about facts for which we should look in vain in the pages of Socrates. But it remains true that there are many other passages in which he simply echoes Socrates.

⁸ Socrat. *H. E.*, v. 15, οὐ πολὺν ἐπιβίωσαντος χρόνον.

uses similar expressions,¹ of which we need not take special account, because in regard to this matter Sozomen evidently derived his facts from Socrates. As a rule, both Socrates and Sozomen are very vague in their chronology. In regard to the particular date which we are investigating, it is to be noted that in a passage, which follows very soon after the words quoted above, Socrates implies that S. Flavian was reconciled to Rome and Alexandria "shortly after" ² Evagrius' death. It appears, therefore, that, according to Socrates, Evagrius died not long after 389 and shortly before 398, which was the date of S. Flavian's reconciliation with Siricius and Theophilus. This leaves us free to assign Evagrius' death to whichever year between 389 and 398 may on other grounds seem most probable.

Now, I think that there can be no question that Evagrius was alive when S. Chrysostom preached his eleventh Homily on the Epistle to the Ephesians. As we have seen, S. Chrysostom preached that homily in order to deter the members of the great Church of Antioch from "going over" to the Eustathians; and in a passage, which I have quoted in the eleventh Lecture, he puts into the mouths of the mocking heathen the following words: "If the doctrines are the same, if the mysteries are the same, why does one of the two rulers invade the other church?"³ Clearly each of the two churches had, at the time when the homily was delivered, its own *ἔρχων*. There was, no doubt, on either side a company or college of presbyters; but each side was also headed by its own "ruler." The passage, which I have just quoted, appears to me to be a demonstrative proof that the Eustathians had still a bishop, or, in other words, that Evagrius was still alive. Stiltinck takes care not to quote that passage; but in order to support the theory that Evagrius was dead, he cites from the homily two other passages,⁴ which in his opinion make in favour of his thesis. His argument is so weak that I do not think it worth while to load these pages by quoting the passages at length, but I shall give full references to them in the notes. In the first passage S. Chrysostom is proving that schismatics, no less than heretics, run into great danger of perdition. Every one, he thinks, will admit that a terrible punishment would be meted out to the subject of a king who should tear his master's purple into pieces, or, still worse, should tear his master himself limb from limb; how much more awful, then, will be the future lot of schismatics who slay and dismember Christ Himself!⁵ There is absolutely nothing in the whole passage which has the most distant bearing on the question whether Evagrius was alive or dead when the homily was preached. In the second passage, part of which I have already quoted,⁶ S. Chrysostom ends up by saying, "If we have been lawfully appointed, persuade those

¹ Sozom. *H. E.*, vii. 15 et viii. 3.

² Socrat. *H. E.*, v. 15, μικρὸν ὕστερον.

³ See the context quoted on p. 369.

⁴ Cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. iv. Septembr., p. 495.

⁵ The passage will be found in Field's edition of S. Chrysostom's *Commentary on the Galatians and Homilies on the Ephesians*, Oxon., 1852, pp. 224, 225, A, B, and in the Benedictine edition of S. Chrysostom's *Works*, tom. xi. p. 88, A, B.

⁶ See p. 370.

who have illegally mounted the throne (τοὺς παρανόμως ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον ἀναβεβηκότας) to resign."¹ In this passage, when S. Chrysostom says, "If *we* have been lawfully appointed," he evidently means by "*we*" S. Flavian and his priests; and similarly, when he speaks of "those who have illegally mounted the throne," there is no difficulty in understanding him to refer to Evagrius and the Eustathian presbyters. But Stiltinck, while he admits that S. Flavian is included in the "*we*" of the first clause, holds that Evagrius cannot be included among those who are said in the second clause to "have illegally mounted the throne."² I can see no possible reason for arriving at such a conclusion. Stiltinck's argument seems to me to break down completely; and our previous conclusion holds the field, namely, that Evagrius was still alive when the eleventh Homily on the Epistle to the Ephesians was preached.³

One final question remains to be considered: Was Evagrius in communion with Siricius of Rome when S. Chrysostom delivered the homily which we have been considering? My answer to that question is that Evagrius most probably was in communion with Rome in 395. Evagrius, as a Eustathian, must have been brought up outside of the Roman communion. He was for the first time admitted to communion by Rome, when, in 362 or early in 363, he arrived in Italy in company with S. Eusebius of Vercellae. For about twenty-nine or thirty years he remained in communion with the successive Roman bishops. There seems no reason to suppose that Pope Siricius withdrew his communion from him after his uncanonical consecration by Paulinus. Theodoret expressly tells us that, notwithstanding the breaches of the canons involved in that consecration, the Romans and the Egyptians "embraced the communion of Evagrius."⁴ Some time afterwards it would appear that the Egyptians withdrew from Evagrius' communion; for S. Ambrose, in a letter addressed in 392 to Theophilus of Alexandria, mentions that the Council of Capua had referred the rival claims of S. Flavian and of Evagrius to the judgement of Theophilus and his brethren, the bishops of Egypt, on the ground that the Egyptian Church was not in communion with either party.⁵ Theophilus must therefore have withdrawn his communion from Evagrius before the Council of Capua met in the course of the winter of 391-92.

¹ Stiltinck's second passage will be found in Field's edition (*ut supra*), pp. 225, C, 226, A, B, C, and in the Benedictine edition, tom. xi. pp. 88, C, 89, A, B, C.

² The word *θρόνον* must be here understood to include, not only the bishop's throne, but also the *subsellia* of the presbyters. I have therefore no objection to Stiltinck translating the singular *θρόνον* by the plural *sedes*. But what is to be said of Dr. Rivington, who, when commenting on my treatment of this passage in the earlier editions of this book, takes me to task for having translated "the plural into singular," and a little lower down ventures to say, "It is the plural that suggests that S. Chrysostom is speaking of the 'seats of the elders'" (see *The Appeal to History*, p. 24).

³ Tillemont (xi. 629), speaking of this homily and of the Eustathians, says, "S. Chrysostome dit assez nettement qu'ils avaient encore un évêque." Newman in his Preface to the Oxford translation of S. Chrysostom on the Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians, p. x., implies as much. Rauschen (*Jahrbücher*, pp. 296, 341) expresses the opinion that Evagrius died in 398; and on p. 529 he declares that Evagrius was alive when the homilies on the Ephesians were preached.

⁴ Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 23.

⁵ Cf. S. Ambros. *Ep.* lvi. *ad Theophilum*, § 2, *P. L.*, xvi. 1220.

That council seems to have decided that the communion of the West should be given to all the bishops throughout the East, who professed the Catholic faith, but that it should be temporarily withheld from the two Antiochene claimants, in order that their cause might be judged by the bishops of Egypt. This decision was no doubt sanctioned both by Siricius and by S. Ambrose. However, S. Flavian, whose cause had long before been decided in his favour by his proper judges, the bishops of the East, absolutely refused to take any steps which would imply that their judgement could be reopened. He was quite willing to resign his bishopric, if Theodosius should advise such a course, but he would not compromise the rights of the bishops of the East by submitting their final judgement on a disciplinary controversy, which had arisen within the bounds of their jurisdiction, to the revision of the West. By acting thus S. Flavian was faithful to the Eastern tradition, and was loyally adhering to the rule laid down by the Second Ecumenical Council in its second canon. S. Flavian therefore refused to yield obedience to Theophilus' citations or to argue his case before him. S. Ambrose, in his letter, recommended Theophilus to summon S. Flavian once again, so that, if he should persist in his refusal to appear, Theophilus might proceed to ulterior measures. Those measures would certainly include the restoration of the communion of the West and of Egypt to Evagrius, and would probably also involve the fulmination of an excommunication against S. Flavian for contumacy. As Evagrius, instead of dying, as has been so often asserted, in 392 or 393, certainly lived on until 395, and perhaps until 398, this course was probably taken; and so in all probability the Eustathians enjoyed the communion of the West until the death of Evagrius. This result is corroborated by the fact that in 395 a number of earnest people at Antioch were breaking away from the communion of S. Flavian, and were being "received" by Evagrius.¹ It is hardly conceivable that they could have done this if Evagrius had stood absolutely alone, deprived of the communion of both East and West. Dr. Rivington himself seems to think that Evagrius was in the communion of Rome when he died; for he says, "Rome gave up the Eustathians after Evagrius' death."² That is, I think, a true account of the matter.

¹ Compare pp. 369, 370.

² *The Appeal to History*, p. 25.

EXCURSUS I.

On the date of the Roman Council which petitioned Gratian on the subject of the trial of bishops in the letter Et hoc Glorise Vestrae.
(See p. 145.)

STRICTLY speaking, it is not necessary for my argument in Lecture IV. to ascertain the date of this council. But as, in my opinion, the effects of Gratian's reply to the petition of the council were very far-reaching, it is a matter of considerable historical interest to me to determine what the date of the council really was. I am not satisfied with the conclusions of previous writers on this matter, and I venture to propose a new solution of the problem.¹

Usually this council has been assigned to the latter part of the year 378, principally on the ground that, according to the heading of its synodical letter,² as that heading appears in the great collections of the councils, the letter was addressed to the Emperors Gratian and Valentinian II., no mention being made of either Valens or Theodosius.³ Now, Valens died on August 9, 378; and Theodosius was proclaimed joint Emperor with Gratian and Valentinian II. on January 19, 379. Blondel,⁴ Labbe,⁵ Pagi,⁶ Tillemont,⁷ Mansi,⁸ Günther,⁹ and others, draw the conclusion that the Roman Council must have been held in the autumn or in the beginning of the winter of 378. On the other hand, Merenda argues¹⁰ in favour of the date 380; and he is followed by Hefele,¹¹ Langen,¹² and Duchesne.¹³ Meyer mentions both opinions, but

¹ Ihm (*Studia Ambrosiana*, p. 7) observes with great truth, "Chronologia Damasiana nondum satis constat, sed ut de illa accuratius inquiratur necesse est." Similarly, Dr. Robertson (*Athanasius*, p. 488) says, "The history of the synods held by Damasus seems hopelessly obscure."

² This letter, which commences with the words, *Et hoc Glorise Vestrae*, is printed, not only in the Collections of the councils, but also in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.*, xiii. 575-584.

³ Similarly, the rescript, addressed to Aquilinus, which was written in response to the Roman Council's letter, has in its inscription only the names of Gratian and Valentinian. This rescript is printed in *P. L.*, xiii. 583-588.

⁴ Blondel, *De la Primauté dans l'Église*, edit. 1641, p. 194.

⁵ Labbe, quoted in Coleti, ii. 1191, 1192.

⁶ Pagi, *Critica*, ad ann. 378, n. xvii., edit. 1728, tom. i. p. 549.

⁷ Tillemont, viii. 776.

⁸ Mansi, *Concilia*, iii. 624, 627.

⁹ *Avellana Collectio*, edit. Günther, 1895, p. 54.

¹⁰ Merenda, *De S. Damasi Opusculis et Gestis*, cap. xiii. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 189.

¹¹ Hefele, *E. tr.*, ii. 292.

¹² Langen, *Geschichte der Römischen Kirche*, tom. i. p. 506, n. 2.

¹³ Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, p. 214.

without deciding in favour of either one or the other. In his view "nescitur annus et Aquilini¹ vicarii et concilii Romani."²

I agree with Merenda that no very great stress can be laid on the fact that only two Emperors are named in the heading of the synodical epistle, as that heading appears in the printed editions. All the editions of the epistle depend on the first edition, published by Sirmond in 1631. He took the letter from a manuscript in the Royal Library at Paris.³ But there is evidence to show that a manuscript copy of the letter found a place, near the end of the eleventh century, in the library of the celebrated monastery of Pomposa, near Ravenna, in which copy the name of Theodosius occurred after the names of Gratian and Valentinian. The truth of this fact rests on the evidence of a certain clerk, Henry,⁴ who was living in the abbey of Pomposa somewhere near the year 1100. The evidence in regard to the heading of the letter would therefore seem to be in a measure conflicting. The name of Theodosius was apparently absent from the Paris manuscript used by Sirmondus, but, if we may trust the testimony of the above-mentioned Henry, it was present in the Pomposa manuscript.

However, even if the common reading of the names of the Augusti in the heading of the synodical letter, as it is usually printed, rested on a considerable number of concordant manuscripts, as, I suppose, is the case in regard to the inscription of the rescript to Aquilinus,⁵ it would still remain the fact that it is not at all an unusual thing to find that the

¹ Aquilinus was the functionary to whom Gratian's rescript in reply to the petition of the council was addressed.

² *Index Scholarum in Academia Georgia Augusta per semestre aestivum 1888 habendarum. Insunt epistolae imperatorum romanorum ex collectione canonum Avellana a Guilelmo Meyer Spirensi editae*, Gottingae, p. 11.

³ See Sirmond's preface to his appendix to the Theodosian Code (*Opera Varia*, edit. Venet., 1728, tom. i. inter columnas 402 et 403). Meyer (*Op. cit.*, p. 10) speaks of the *codex* used by Sirmond as "nunc ignotus."

⁴ Montfaucon, in his *Diarium Italicum* (edit. 1702, pp. 81-96), quotes a letter written by a certain clerk, named Henry, to one Stephen, in which is found a catalogue of the manuscripts in the Pomposa Library, drawn up near the end of the eleventh century. On pp. 92, 93 may be read the following items in this catalogue: "Legatio Aquileiensis concilii ad Imperatores, Gratianum, Valentinianum, et Theodosium: hic liber sic incipit: 'Imperatoribus clementissimis et christianissimis.' Item Ambrosii ad eosdem: 'Imperatoribus clementissimis et christianissimis.' Item alia ejusdem concilii: 'Imperatoribus clementissimis.' Item alia ad eosdem: 'Et hoc gloriae vestrae clementissimus princeps.'" It is to be observed that the last entry does not attribute the letter *Et hoc gloriae vestrae* to S. Ambrose, as Merenda wrongly declares (*De S. Damasi Opusculis et Gestis*, cap. xvi. § 2, P. L., xiii. 208), nor need it necessarily be understood as attributing it to the Council of Aquileia, as Merenda also wrongly asserts (*loc. cit.*); but it does imply that the letter with which we are dealing was addressed to the three Emperors, Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius. Henry's letter to Stephen was in the library of the Duke of Modena at the end of the 17th century (see Montfaucon's *Diarium Italicum*, p. 80), and it is in that same library, now usually called the Biblioteca Estense, at the present time (see the *Statistica delle Biblioteche*, parte i. vol. i. p. 185).

⁵ But Günther has shown, in his *Prolegomena* to the Vienna edition of the *Collectio Avellana* (pp. xxv., xxxiii., and xxxix.), that all the existing manuscripts of that collection depend on the *Codex Vaticanus* 3787, usually known as V, so that the text of the imperial rescript is based, like the text of the synodical petition, on the evidence of only one manuscript.

name of an Emperor has dropped out from an inscription or heading of an imperial constitution at a very early stage, before that constitution was incorporated into one or other of the codes. Meyer rightly calls attention to this fact, when speaking of those who uphold the date 378 on the ground that only the names of Gratian and Valentinian II. appear in the heading of the synodical letter, and in the inscription of the rescript, "although," he says, "inscriptionibus multorum edictorum desit nomen unius alteriusve Augusti."¹

But, even if we assume that the name of Theodosius was absent from the heading of the synodical letter and from the rescript, as they were originally written, it will not by any means necessarily follow that these letters were written during the five months which intervened between the death of Valens and the accession of Theodosius. There are instances of petitions addressed, not to all the Emperors, but to the Eastern alone or the Western alone; and there are also instances of legislative acts emanating from either the Eastern or the Western Emperor or Emperors. Thus the second Ecumenical Council petitioned Theodosius to confirm its decrees. The council made no reference in its petition to any wish on its part that its decrees should be confirmed by Gratian and Valentinian II. The synodical letter embodying the petition is given by Coleti.² Socrates³ and Sozomen⁴ tell us that, as a matter of fact, the decrees of the council were confirmed by Theodosius. Unfortunately, his rescript of confirmation is not extant. If it were, I think that it would be found that Gratian and Valentinian II. were not mentioned in the inscription. However that might be, we have in this letter of the second Ecumenical Council an instance of an Eastern synod petitioning the Eastern Emperor to take legislative action, just as the Roman synod, the date of which we are investigating, asked the two Western Emperors to take legislative action.

Similarly, two synodical letters from the bishops of North Italy were addressed to Theodosius only, in 381 or 382.⁵ Both letters have the same inscription, which runs thus: "Beatissimo imperatori, et clementissimo principi Theodosio, Ambrosius et caeteri episcopi Italiae." No mention is made of either Gratian or Valentinian II.

On October 11, 449, S. Leo and a synod at Rome sent a letter of petition to the Eastern Emperor, Theodosius the Younger, praying him to set aside the Robber-council of Ephesus, and to summon a larger council. The inscription of this synodical letter runs thus: "Leo episcopus et sancta Synodus, quae in urbe Roma convenit, Theodosio augusto."⁶ No mention is made of Valentinian III., the Western Emperor.

These are all instances of synodical petitions addressed, not to

¹ Meyer, *Op. cit.*, p. 11. It may be well to give three or four instances of such inaccuracies, which are to be found in considerable numbers in the Theodosian Code. Gratian's name has dropped out of the inscription in *Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 5, 3, and also in xvi. 6, 1. The name of Arcadius has dropped out in *Cod. Theod.*, xv. 1, 22. On the other hand, the name of Gratian has been wrongly added to those of Valentinian and Valens in *Cod. Theod.*, xiv. 15, 2.

² ii. 1123.

³ v. 8.

⁴ vii. 9.

⁵ Cf. *Epp. inter Ambrosianas* xiii. et xiv., *P. L.*, xvi. 990-995.

⁶ Coleti, iv. 802.

all the Emperors, but to the Eastern Emperor only. I go on to give examples of imperial legislative acts emanating from the Emperor of the West only.

On December 3, 408, Honorius alone addressed a law to Theodorus, Prefect of the praetorium of Italy.¹ In the inscription no mention is made of Theodosius II., who had been proclaimed Augustus six years before, and whose name appears in the inscription of a law dated nine days earlier,² and of another dated ten days later.³

On January 18, 417, Honorius alone, without any mention of Theodosius II., addressed a law to the patrician Constantius.⁴

I have reserved for the last a very remarkable parallel to the two documents which we are considering, that is to say, to the petition of the Roman Council to the Western Emperors, Gratian and Valentinian II., and to the subsequent rescript of those Emperors to Aquilinus. On July 1, 420, Pope Boniface of Rome addressed a supplication to Honorius, the heading of which runs thus: "Supplicatio papae Bonifatii, ut constituatur a principe, quatenus in urbe Roma numquam per ambitum ordinetur antistes." The inscription is worded as follows: "Bonifatius episcopus Honorio Augusto." In reply to this supplication, Honorius sent a rescript, of which the heading runs thus: "Epistola Imperatoris Honorii ad Bonifatium Episcopum Rom., qua statuit ut si ordinati fuerint duo Episcopi ambo de civitate pellantur." The rescript has the following inscription: "Victor Honorius inclytus triumphator semper Augustus sancto ac venerabili Bonifatio papae urbis aeternae."⁵ In neither the supplication nor the rescript is any mention made of Theodosius the Younger. I leave the details of the parallel to the reader's discrimination.

These various instances of the absence of one or more of the names of the Emperors from the headings and inscriptions of petitions and rescripts make it quite allowable to suppose that the name of Theodosius was intentionally omitted from the heading of the synodical letter *Et hoc gloriae vestrae*, and from the inscription of the rescript to Aquilinus. And this supposition seems to be all the more justifiable when we observe that both the petition and the rescript are limited in their scope to the Western Empire.⁶ It follows from all that has been said, that no conclusive argument in regard to the date of the Roman Council, about which we are speaking, can be deduced from the

¹ *Append. Cod. Theod.*, lex xvi., Sirmond. *Opp.*, edit. Venet., 1728, i. 415, 416.

² *Op. cit.*, lex xii., Sirmond. *Opp.*, i. 411, 412.

³ *Op. cit.*, lex xviii., Sirmond. *Opp.*, i. 416.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, lex xix., Sirmond. *Opp.*, i. 417.

⁵ A critical edition of these two documents will be found in Meyer's edition of certain portions of the *Collectio Avellana* (pars ii. pp. 33-37). This second part of Meyer's work was published at Göttingen, in the *Index Scholarum* for the winter term of 1888-89.

⁶ Merenda (*Op. cit.*, cap. xiii. § 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 188, 189) says, "Neque semper omnium imperatorum nomina exprimebantur in litteris, quae ad eos pro rerum opportunitate scribebantur, neque id necesse videbatur, cum satis esset ut litterae aut rescripta eorum principum nomen praeferrerent, quorum erat iis in locis imperium ac potestas, quod (ne ego non necessario labore defungar) ex Symmacho colligi potest."

heading of its synodical letter, as it stands printed in the collections of councils.

I have set forth the arguments and evidence on this point at what may seem needless length, because Günther, Rauschen,¹ and other recent writers seem to regard the argument from the headings as conclusive in favour of the date 378.

In order that we may obtain light on the question of the date of our Roman Council, which was mainly occupied with scandals arising out of the proceedings of the anti-pope Ursinus, it will be well to get such information as may be attainable about the doings and whereabouts of this anti-pope during the term of years within which the synodical letter *Et hoc gloriae vestrae* must have been written. And our best source of information on this subject will, I think, be found in the letter *Provisum est*² of the Council of Aquileia.

The date of the Council of Aquileia, as it appears in the acts of the council,³ is September, 381, and I accept that date as a chronological fact which cannot be shaken.⁴

In their letter *Provisum est*, the Aquileian Fathers make it clear that Ursinus was not cooped up during the year 381 in some one place of confinement in distant Gaul, but that (1) not very long before the Council of Aquileia he had been at Milan, leaguering himself with the Arians there; and that (2) at the time when the Council of Aquileia was being held there was considerable danger of his being received in audience by the Emperor Gratian. I will take these two points in their order.

(1) The following passage occurs in the Aquileian letter, with which we are dealing: "Often as he, [Ursinus], has been found guilty of turbulence, he *still* goes on (*incedit adhuc*) as if his past conduct was calculated to inspire no horror. He was often, as we have ascertained and seen in the present council, in union and combination with the Arians at the time when he was endeavouring, in company with Valens, to disturb the Church of Milan with their detestable assembly; organizing secret mixed meetings, sometimes before the doors of the synagogue and sometimes in the houses of the Arians, and uniting his friends to them; and, as he could not go openly himself to their congregations, teaching and informing them in what way the Church's peace might be disturbed."⁵

It will be noticed that these proceedings of Ursinus at Milan are brought forward to illustrate the charge that "he still goes on" with his turbulence. Such an illustration of that charge would hardly have been thought of, if the proceedings had not been recent. And this conclusion is corroborated by what is said about Ursinus' league with Valens. For when was Valens at Milan? We can gather the answer to this question from another synodical letter of the Council of Aquileia, the letter

¹ Rauschen, *Jahrbücher der Christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius dem Grossen*, p. 31, n. 3.

² *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xi., *P. L.*, xvi. 985-987.

³ *Gest. Concil. Aquil.* § 1, *S. Ambros. Opp.*, *P. L.*, xvi. 955.

⁴ I say this notwithstanding Rade's attempt (*Damasus, Bischof von Rom*, 1832, p. 63) to assign the council to the year 380. On this attempt, see what I have written below on p. 515, n. 4.

⁵ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xi. § 3, *P. L.*, xvi. 986.

Benedictus Deus.¹ We learn from that document that Julius Valens, who had been intruded by the Arians into the see of Pettau, on the borders of Noricum and Pannonia Prima, had betrayed his country and his city to the Goths; and that now, at the time of the Aquileian Council, he was contaminating the cities of North Italy by his unlawful ordinations; and in particular had been making a disturbance at Milan (nunc Mediolani . . . inequitavit).² Now, the Goths crossed for the first time the frontiers of the Western Empire and burst into Pannonia, after Theodosius was taken ill, at the beginning of February, 380.³ The invading army was commanded by the Ostrogothic chiefs, Alatheus and Safrac. As the Goths agreed to a truce with Gratian in the summer of 380, it must have been during the spring or early summer of that year that Valens betrayed Pettau to the barbarians. It follows that Ursinus' co-operation with the Arians at Milan must have taken place either in the latter part of 380 or the earlier part of 381.⁴ I submit, therefore, that my first point is proved; and I go on to discuss the second point.

(2) I have to show that at the time when the Council of Aquileia was being held there was considerable danger of Ursinus being received in audience by the Emperor Gratian. The council in its letter, *Provisum est*, is in form addressing all the three Emperors, but the letter is really meant for Gratian.⁵ The bishops say, "We are aware of the holy modesty of your Clemencies. Let not [Ursinus] press upon you words unbecoming your ears, or noisily utter things that are alien from the office and name of a bishop, or speak to you things that are immodest."⁶ This passage evidently presupposes that it was not at all impossible that Ursinus might succeed in persuading Gratian to admit him to a personal interview. In the previous paragraph the council had urged S. Paul's

¹ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* x., *P. L.*, xvi. 980-984.

² *Op. cit.*, coll. 983, 984. Professor Ihm of Halle has kindly supplied me with references to the following passages, as illustrating the use of "inequitare" in this passage: S. Ambros. *Expos. Psalm. cxviii.*, x. 41; *De Obitu Theod.*, 7; *De Offic.*, i. 48, 232; *Epist.* lxx. 21; *De Bello Jud.*, v. 5, 11.

³ Jordanes, *Getica*, cap. xxvii., edit. Mommsen, p. 95 (I have quoted the passage on p. 331, note 3). Compare Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, 2nd edit., vol. i. part i. p. 304. It is true that S. Ambrose (*De Fide*, II. xvi. 140, *P. L.*, xvi. 613), writing in 378 or 377, says, "Nonne de Thraciae partibus per Ripensem Daciam et Mysiam, omnemque Valeriam Pannoniorum, totum illum limitem sacrilegis pariter vocibus et barbaricis motibus audivimus inhorrentem?" But I think that the saint, in his reference to Valeria, is alluding to the invasion of that province by the Quadi in 374 and 375 in revenge for the treacherous murder of their king, Gabinius, by Marcellian, the Duke of Valeria (compare Hodgkin, *Op. cit.*, i. 200, 219). I am not aware that we read of any conflicts fought out on the soil of the Western Empire, between the troops of that empire and the Goths, before the date of the publication of S. Ambrose's second book, *De Fide*. In any case, S. Ambrose does not suggest that the provinces of Pannonia Prima and Noricum had been invaded, an operation which would have been necessary, if the town of Pettau had been attacked.

⁴ Incidentally I would point out how irreconcilable these facts are with Rade's theory that the Council of Aquileia was held in September, 380.

⁵ The letter deals with Western affairs, and therefore has nothing to do with Theodosius; and, as for Valentinian II., he was only ten years old.

⁶ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xi. § 5, *P. L.*, xvi. 986, "Scimus clementiae vestrae sanctum pudorem; ne auditu vestro indigna ingerat, non aliena ab officio et nomine sacerdotis interstreat, non inverecunda vobis loquatur."

words, "A man that is an heretic after one admonition avoid,"¹ and also S. John's precept in regard to false teachers, that they are not to be received by Christians into their house, and that they are to be given no greeting.² The bishops end the paragraph thus, "And therefore we pray and beseech you that you would condescend to take from him [Ursinus] the opportunity of getting at you."³ The letter closes with a renewal of the same petition in other words: "We therefore entreat you to get rid of that most importunate person, and thus to restore the sense of security, which has been interrupted, both to us bishops and to the people of Rome, who, ever since the Prefect of the City has sent in his report, have remained in uncertainty and suspense."⁴ It seems clear from these passages that in August and September, 381, Ursinus was living in some place where it would be possible for him to have access to Gratian.

The question may here be asked—Where was Gratian at this time? The Theodosian Code shows that he was this year at Aquileia on April 22,⁵ and on May 8,⁶ and also that he was at the same place on December 26.⁷ There is, however, a law dated from Trier on October 14.⁸ If the date is correct, a hypothesis which is to me very improbable, Gratian must have paid a hurried visit to Gaul in the autumn. If he did so, there would be no need for him to leave North Italy⁹ before September 17, or even a day or two later, in order to reach Trier by October 14.¹⁰ As the Council of Aquileia met on the third of September, Gratian may well have been in North Italy during the sitting of the council,¹¹ even on the supposition of his having really been at Trier in October. But I am bound to say that, in my opinion, the more probable view is that Gratian remained in North Italy during the whole of the year 381.¹² Apart from the date of this one

¹ Tit. iii. 10.

² Compare 2 S. John 10.

³ "Et ideo petimus et rogamus ut obrepenti ei adimere dignemini facultatem."

⁴ "Oramus igitur, ut jam et populo Romano, qui post relationem praefecti Urbis pendet incertus, et nobis sacerdotibus securitatem interdictam importunissimi hominis abjectione tribuatis."

⁵ *Cod. Theod.*, xv. 10, 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, xv. 7, 8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, xi. 1, 18.

⁸ *Ibid.*, iv. 22, 2.

⁹ Milan was Gratian's most usual place of residence in North Italy; but in 382 we find him also at Verona and Brixen, and twice at Padua.

¹⁰ The accurate and painstaking Tillemont, speaking of the time which it would take to make the journey from Trier to Aquileia, says (*Vies des Empereurs*, v. 708), "Il est aisé que Gratien fut à Trèves le 15 de fevrier, et à Aquilée le 14 de mars." He says again (*loc. cit.*), "Il n'est pas même impossible qu'il ait été d'Aquilée à Trèves entre le 27 de Juin et le 14 de juillet." In these passages Tillemont is not speaking of the year 381. It should be observed that the distance to Trier from some parts of North Italy would be less than the distance from Aquileia.

¹¹ Gratian was not in Aquileia itself during the sitting of the council. The Fathers ask him to bid their legates return speedily with the news that their petitions had been granted (*Ep. inter Ambrosianas* x. § 11, *P. L.*, xvi. 984).

¹² Just about this time there were several laws which, in the form in which they appear in the Code, purport to be dated from Trier, and which nevertheless cannot really have been dated in that place. Thus in 379, *Cod. Theod.*, xi. 36, 26, which is dated April 5, and *Cod. Theod.*, vi. 28, 1, which is dated August 4, purport to have been issued at Trier; but Gratian was certainly not at Trier at either of those dates. Similarly, in the year 380, *Cod. Theod.*, xiv. 3, 17, was issued on July 12, and purports to be dated from Trier, but Gratian was not there at that date; and the same remark applies to *Cod. Theod.*, xv. 7, 6, which purports

law, there is no trace elsewhere of any visit of Gratian to Gaul at this time. My own belief is that the law in question belongs to the year 379.¹

Unless I am much mistaken, my argument seems to show that at some time between the summer of 380 and September, 381, Ursinus was able to come to Milan, and that there is a strong probability that he was still in North Italy at the time when the Council of Aquileia met.

At this point it will be well to consider how the State had been dealing with Ursinus since the year 366, when he first began to act the part of an anti-pope. After the first outbreak of hostilities between the party of Damasus and the party of Ursinus, in October, 366, the anti-pope and two of his deacons were sent into exile by Viventius, the Prefect of the City.² This first banishment of Ursinus was of the severer kind; that is to say, Ursinus was not "relegatus" but "deportatus."³ The exiles were released from their banishment during the course of the next summer, and returned to Rome on September 15, 367. But two months afterwards, on November 16, no doubt on account of renewed discord with the party of Damasus, Ursinus was banished again and was confined to one place in Gaul. This time the banishment was not a *deportatio* but a *relegatio*.⁴ At some time between January 1, 371, and August 22, 372,⁵ Ursinus was set free from his confinement to one place in Gaul, and to be dated from Trier on April 24, 381. Compare Rauschen, pp. 37, 38, 59 (n. 2), 82.

¹ Gratian had reached Trier by September 14, 379 (*Cod. Theod.*, xiii. 3, 12), and he was there until the middle of March, 380 (see Rauschen's *Jahrbücher*, p. 59). He was addressing laws from Trier to Potitus, the *Vicarius Urbis*, in September and October, 379. Thus *Cod. Theod.*, iv. 16, 2, was addressed to Potitus on September 22, 379, and *Cod. Theod.* viii., 8, 2, was addressed to the same Potitus on October 25, 379. Now the law which is dated in the Code from Trier on October 14, 381, is also addressed to this same Potitus, and according to the inscription of that law he was still holding the office of *Vicarius Urbis* at the date of its enactment. It seems to me to be highly probable that some early copyist has made a mistake in regard to the names of the consuls in the subscription of this law, and that it really belongs to the group of laws addressed to Potitus in the summer and autumn of 379. If it were worth while, other alternative corrections might be suggested, which would make it unnecessary to assume a journey of Gratian to Trier in 381; but any student of the Theodosian Code will be able to make them for himself. Such corrections are continually needed, if we are to educe from the dates in the Code any consistent chronological system. The need of some correction in regard to the date of this particular law is corroborated by the fact that Antidius, and not Potitus, was apparently the *Vicarius Urbis* in 381. *Cod. Theod.*, ix. 38, 6, which was addressed to Antidius the *Vicarius*, was published at Rome on July 21, 381. On this Antidius see Cantarelli's article, *La Serie Dei Vicarii Urbis Romae* in the *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma*, serie iii., 1890, pp. 80, 81.

² Cf. *Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem*, § 6, in Meyer (*Op. cit.*, pars i. p. 13), or in Günther (*Collect. Avellan.*, p. 3).

³ See Valentinian's letter to Praetextatus (Meyer, *Op. cit.*, pars i. n. 5, p. 15, or Günther, *Op. cit.*, ep. v. § 1, p. 48).

⁴ Cf. *Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem*, § 11 (Meyer, *Op. cit.*, pars i. p. 14, or Günther, *Op. cit.*, ep. i. § 11, p. 4). And for the fact that Ursinus was banished to one place in Gaul, see Valentinian's letters to the Prefect Ampelius and to the Vicar Maximinus (Meyer, *Op. cit.*, pars i. nn. 11 et 12, pp. 18, 19, or Günther, *Op. cit.*, epp. xi. et xii., pp. 52, 53).

⁵ These dates define the extreme possible limits of the period to which Ampelius' tenure of the prefecture of Rome must be assigned. It was in a letter addressed to Ampelius that Valentinian signified his will that Ursinus' freedom should be enlarged.

was allowed to wander wheresoever he willed, so only he did not set foot either in Rome or in the suburbicarian regions, that is to say, within the sphere of Damasus' episcopal and metropolitical jurisdiction.¹ The banishment in Gaul had lasted for at least three years, and for at most four years and three quarters.

If we are to accept the views of those who hold that the letter of the Roman Council, *Et hoc gloriæ vestrae*, and Gratian's rescript, *Ordinariorum sententiae*, were written between the death of Valens on August 9, 378, and the accession of Theodosius on January 19, 379, we must suppose that at some time before January, 379, Ursinus had been again banished to Gaul, and was there confined in Cologne. For Gratian, in his rescript to Aquilinus, expressly says, "Gaul holds Ursinus in confinement, and seclusion at Cologne restrains him from stirring up any unquiet movements."² On that hypothesis we must suppose that about two years after the issue of the rescript, Gratian liberated Ursinus once more from his confinement; for we have seen that in 381, if not already in 380, Ursinus was at large in Milan and North Italy.

Moreover, when we recall the strong arguments by which S. Ambrose and the Fathers of Aquileia urged Gratian to "take away from" Ursinus "the opportunity of getting at him," and "to restore a sense of security to the bishops" of the West "and to the people of Rome" by "getting rid of that most importunate person,"³ and when we remember S. Ambrose's influence with Gratian, we can hardly doubt that the effect of the Aquileian letter, *Provisum est*, would be to induce the Emperor to relegate Ursinus again to some distant place of confinement. Thus we should have to suppose that Ursinus was banished four times, namely, in 366, in 367, at some date between 371 and 379, and again in 381; all four banishments being caused by the same trouble, namely, Ursinus' factious opposition to Damasus. Any theory which involves such a result seems to me to be *prima facie* improbable. Before accepting such an account of the matter, it would be better to consider whether the third banishment cannot be eliminated altogether, and whether such a date cannot be assigned to the Roman Council as would be consistent with the notion that that confinement of Ursinus in Cologne, which is mentioned in the rescript of Aquilinus, was posterior to the Council of Aquileia, and resulted from its action.

But before I quit the consideration of the widely diffused theory that the Roman Council of which I am writing was held in the latter part of 378, it seems well to mention a strong argument against that date, which was first formulated by Merenda. That ingenious, though often mistaken, author points out⁴ that, after Gratian had heard the news of the crushing defeat which had overwhelmed the Roman forces on the field of Hadrianople, and of the tragic death of the Emperor Valens which had followed,

¹ On the possible connexion of Evagrius of Antioch with the suggestion of the details of this arrangement, see p. 303, note 2.

² *Rescript. Gratian. ad Aquilinum*, § 4 (Meyer, *Op. cit.*, pars i. n. 13, p. 20, or Günther, *Op. cit.*, ep. xiii. § 4, p. 55), "Ursinus quidem Gallia coerchet et, ne motus aliquos inquietos exercent, cohibet Agrippina secessio."

³ See p. 516.

⁴ *De S. Damasi Opusculis et Gestis*, cap. xiii. § 2, P. L., xiii. 189.

he returned to Sirmium, and there published a law which provided "that persons of all sects might securely assemble together in their houses of prayer; and that only the Eunomians, Photinians, and Manichaeans should be excluded from the churches."¹ This law must have been published in the latter part of August, 378. A year later, on August 3, 379, Gratian repealed it² and took up a more persecuting attitude towards heretics. Now, the rescript to Aquilinus, which brings the whole power of the empire to bear on the Ursinians, and on the Donatist bishop at Rome, and generally on all Western bishops who had been condemned or who should hereafter be condemned by the authorities of the Catholic Church, harmonizes far better with the legislation of 379 than with that of August, 378. It seems, therefore, that the rescript and the synodical petition which elicited it cannot be earlier than August, 379.

Merenda, Hefele, Duchesne, and others think³ that that synodical petition emanated from the council held at Rome in 380, the council which issued a series of anathemas against Apollinarians, Macedonians, and other heretics; and Merenda holds⁴ that in consequence of the council's petition Gratian banished Ursinus to Cologne some time between the Roman Council of 380 and the Aquileian Council of September, 381;⁵ but he also holds that Gratian did not send his rescript to Aquilinus, in which he dealt with the various requests of the Roman Council, until after he had received the letter *Provisum est* from the Aquileian Council. The reason which he suggests for this extraordinary delay is that Gratian was "tunc bello occupatus." But it does not appear that Gratian was occupied in any special way with the carrying on of any war, after the Goths had agreed to a truce in the summer of 380.⁶ At any rate, he found time to publish three laws at Milan in March, 381,⁷ and other laws at Aquileia in April⁸ and May.⁹

I believe, myself, that the relegation of Ursinus to Cologne took place after the Council of Aquileia, and not before. We have already seen¹⁰ that the Aquileian letter, *Provisum est*, was calculated to induce Gratian to banish Ursinus to some distant place of confinement. Moreover, that same letter informs us that at the time when it was written Ursinus was in some very serious way disturbing the Roman Church, so that the getting rid of Ursinus would "restore a sense of security" "to the people of Rome." And this disturbance of the Roman Church seems to be closely connected with the fact that Ursinus was trying to press upon

¹ Socrat. *H. E.*, v. 2; compare Sozom. *H. E.*, vii. 1.

² *Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 5, 5.

³ See p. 510.

⁴ *De S. Damasi Opusculis et Gestis*, cap. xix. § 1, *P. L.*, xiii. 225.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, cap. xix. §§ 1, 2, *P. L.*, xiii. 225, 226.

⁶ It must be admitted that, even after the truce made with the Goths in the summer of 380, and even after they became *foederati* of the empire in October, 382, they constituted a grave danger; and preparations for war must have been continually going on. This fact would, I think, account for the phrase, "inter tot bellicas necessitates," used by the Council of Aquileia in September, 381, when describing Gratian's position at that time (cf. *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xi. § 2, *P. L.*, xvi. 985).

⁷ *Cod. Theod.*, vi. 10, 2; vi. 22, 5; vi. 26, 2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, xv. 7, 8.

⁸ *Ibid.*, xv. 10, 2.

¹⁰ See p. 518.

Gratian "words unbecoming his ears," and to say to him "immodest things" (*inverecunda*), which would be distressing to Gratian's "sanctus pudor." The council implies, I think, that some very serious charge was being brought against Damasus, which, if it could have been proved, would have destroyed his reputation for chastity. It is impossible to say with certainty what the precise accusation was.¹ The Fathers, out of respect to Gratian and also to Damasus, refrain from going into particulars in regard to the nature of the attack on the Roman Church, which they charge Ursinus with organizing; but they sufficiently indicate its general character. They go on to record that the anti-pope used as his instrument a man named Paschasius, who either came to Rome with letters from Ursinus, or else, being already in Rome, received letters of instruction from that personage,² and thereupon caused disturbances in the city, and stirred up against Damasus certain heathens and other abandoned persons. We may gather that the matter was brought before the chief magistrate of Rome, that is to say, before Valerius Severus, the *Praefectus Urbi*, and that he, after investigating the business, made a report to the Emperor. That was the stage at which the proceedings had arrived when the Council of Aquileia sent off its legates to Gratian with the letter *Provisum est*.

But now all this fits in very well with what we learn from the petition of the Roman Council and from Gratian's rescript, if we may suppose that those documents are later than the Council of Aquileia. The Roman Council reminds Gratian that the party of Ursinus had gone so far as to suborn one, Isaac, a Jew, who, after professing Christianity for some time, had finally relapsed into Judaism, and that they had induced him [probably while he was still a Christian] to attack the person "of our holy brother, Damasus," by devising lying stories.³ They go on to say

¹ The *Liber Pontificalis*, both in its later form and also in that earlier draft, which in Duchesne's opinion was compiled during the pontificate of Hormisdas (A.D. 514-523), but which, according to Mommsen, must be dated about a century later (see p. 414, n. 2), gives great precision to the accusation, which it treats as a slander. But there seems to be good reason for thinking that either the author of the original draft, or the author of the document from which the original draft draws its statement about the accusation against Damasus, was an ardent supporter of Pope Symmachus, and had a controversial object in view, which must very much diminish the weight to be attached to those parts of his story which stand unsupported by other evidence (see Duchesne's edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*, pp. 84, 85). We have every reason to believe that Ursinus' attack was based upon an impudent calumny. In 381 Damasus was more than seventy-five years old.

² Cf. *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xi. § 5 (*P. L.*, xvi. 987), "missis litteris." The letters were evidently written by Ursinus at Milan, and were sent to Rome. The anti-pope, though free to come to Milan, was not allowed to go to Rome (see pp. 517, 518).

³ Dom Morin has argued (*Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses*, tom. iv. pp. 99-121), in a very ingenious and to my mind convincing manner, in favour of identifying this wicked Isaac with the celebrated commentator who goes by the name of Ambrosiaster. If this theory be true, Ambrosiaster must have begun as a Jew, and must then have become a Catholic adhering to Damasus; later on he must have been a schismatic Ursinian; and finally an apostate who relapsed into Judaism. We may suppose Isaac to have been a leader among the "abandoned men" whom Paschasius stirred up. Gratian, in his rescript (§ 9), describes the lying stories against Damasus, which were spread abroad by Ursinus, Isaac, the Bishop of Parma, and others, as being "turpissimae calumniae."

that Isaac was unable to prove the accusations which he had brought, and that he had to bear the punishment due to his demerits, which punishment, as we learn from the rescript, took the form of banishment to a remote corner of Spain. The Roman Council, addressing the two Western Emperors,¹ says further that "the innocence of our aforesaid brother, Damasus, was proved by the judgement of your Tranquillities." It appears therefore, that, if I am right in my view of the matter, what actually happened in the case of this charge brought against Damasus was that it was first investigated by the Prefect of the City, who reported to the Emperor, and that the final sentence was given by Gratian. The Fathers of the council were not satisfied with this procedure. They therefore, later on in their letter, petitioned the Emperor to enact that henceforth, when a charge is brought against a Bishop of Rome, if its investigation is not committed to a synod, the cause should be first examined by the Emperor himself; and that then, if any disputed point presents itself for settlement, a judge should make inquiries as to the nature of the facts, but should not claim the decision of the sentence, which should be reserved to the Emperor. The council was anxious that in such cases the trial should be not only concluded but also begun in the Emperor's consistory.

One other point concerning this trial of Damasus is mentioned in the synodical letter. The synod says that, after Damasus had been acquitted by the Emperor, he voluntarily submitted his case to a council of bishops, no doubt the very council, which was sending the letter which we are considering. If we may accept as true a statement which appears in the *Liber Pontificalis*, the synod which acquitted Damasus consisted of forty-four bishops.²

It appears to me that a theory, which identifies the events mentioned by the bishops at Aquileia with the events more fully described by the bishops gathered in synod at Rome, has much more to say for itself than any theory which requires us to suppose that in two successive years there were two similar attacks on Damasus organized by the same arch-conspirator, that there were two trials before the prefect, two interventions of the Emperor, two banishments of Ursinus. I therefore conclude that it was in the latter part of the year 381 that Damasus was acquitted by Gratian, Isaac was exiled to Spain, and Ursinus was banished to Cologne. It follows that the synodical hearing of the case must have taken place in 382; and, as it would probably take some time to communicate with the leading bishops in Italy, and to consider what had best be done in regard to the bringing of the case before a synod, one would be inclined to suppose that some months intervened between the imperial acquittal with the accompanying banishment of Ursinus, and the synodical re-hearing. Certainly the council, when it did meet, spoke of the banishment of Ursinus to Cologne as of an event which had taken place some time

¹ Valentinian II., who was born in 371 or 372, was a mere boy, and the government of the whole West was really in the hands of Gratian.

² It may, however, be held that forty-four bishops would scarcely describe themselves as "fere innumeri," which is the term used in the letter *Et hoc gloriæ vestræ*. If that view be taken, I have no wish to press the dependableness of the statement in the *Liber Pontificalis*.

back. In its synodical letter the council says to the two Emperors, "Although Ursinus was banished a good long time ago (*licet jamdudum . . . relegatus*)¹ by the judgement of your Clemencies, yet he is trying secretly to seduce every worthless person by means of those whom he has unlawfully and sacrilegiously ordained."

If, then, this Roman Council took place in 382, is it possible for us to come to any conclusion as to the period of the year in which it was held? There was a very celebrated council which met at Rome under the presidency of Damasus in the autumn of that year. It was originally intended to be an Ecumenical Council; but the Eastern bishops held a synod at Constantinople, and refused to come as far as Italy, though they sent three bishops to represent them at the Roman assembly. Two other Eastern prelates came on their own responsibility, namely, Paulinus, Bishop of the Eustathians at Antioch, and S. Epiphanius. Of the Westerns we have good reason for believing that S. Ambrose attended the synod, though on account of illness he was unable to take much part in the proceedings; and after S. Ambrose must be named S. Acholius of Thessalonica, the Primate of Eastern Illyricum, which, so far as ecclesiastical matters were concerned, still belonged to the West. The other members of the council, which, if we may trust Theodoret, was a "very large" one,² came from different parts of the West; but no doubt the majority of them belonged to Italy.

I confess that it does not seem to me very probable that a council so constituted would describe its members as "*innumeri fere ex diffusis Italiae partibus * * * congregati*,"³ which are the words used in the letter

¹ In one sense Ursinus had been "*relegatus*" ever since November 16, 367, when he was banished to some place in Gaul by Valentinian I. No doubt the nature of his *relegatio* had been very much modified in 371 or 372, when he was set free to go anywhere, except that he might not set foot in Rome or in the suburbicarian regions. But that restriction on his freedom was sufficient to maintain him in the condition of a *relegatus*, a condition which arose out of the act of Valentinian the Elder in 367. But I do not for a moment believe that the Fathers of the Roman Council of 382 are referring to Valentinian's act, when they say to Gratian and to Valentinian II. that Ursinus was "*jamdudum relegatus* by the judgement of your Clemencies." They are referring to the much more recent act of Gratian and the younger Valentinian, in virtue of which Ursinus was relegated from Milan, or wherever he was living, and was confined to Cologne. They go on to describe the malpractices of Ursinus, which he continues to carry on, notwithstanding that more recent relegation. The context seems to require that the relegation referred to shall be much later than the original exile of 367. No doubt the word "*jamdudum*" might easily refer to an event which had happened fifteen years before; but it might equally refer to an interval of a few months, or even of a few weeks. Honoratus and Urban, the Mauritanian legates at the third Council of Carthage under S. Aurelius, held on August 28, 397, use the expression, "*jam dudum*," when they are referring to a preliminary meeting of bishops, held a fortnight before, on August 13 of the same year (see Mansi's *Concilia*, iii. 926; and compare Hefele's *Councils*, E. tr., ii. 407).

² Theodoret. *H. E.*, v. 8.

³ In the first two editions of this book (p. 156) I had occasion to quote the last five words of this citation. Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Church*, p. 242; compare p. 239), referring to the mode in which I quoted the words, says, "I do not know why he [*i.e.* myself] puts asterisks in place of the words, 'sublime sanctuary of the Apostolic See.'" It will be observed that the asterisks reappear in the quotation, as printed above, in the text. Both then and now I quote the words which bear on the point with which I am immediately dealing, and omit words

*Et hoc gloriæ vestrae.*¹ Nor does it seem to me likely that Damasus would make arrangements which would have the effect of bringing Isaac's unsavoury charges against himself before the tribunal of a council intended to be ecumenical. It would be far more natural to obtain an acquittal from an Italian Council, summoned earlier in the year, so that, his character having been cleared first by the authorities of the State and then by those of the Church, he might meet the assembled episcopate of East and West without any shadow of a cause for blushing.

As far as I am aware, there is no difficulty in supposing that a council of forty-four bishops, or whatever the number may have been, gathered from different parts of Italy, may have met at Rome in May or June, 382.² On the whole, taking all the facts into consideration, that date seems to me to be approximately the best date to assign to the council which addressed the letter *Et hoc gloriæ vestrae* to Gratian and Valentinian II.

I think that we shall be led to accept this conclusion more readily if we turn our attention to one expression in the synodical letter of the council, which seems to me to have been overlooked. In § 9 the council asks the two Emperors to make a law, in accordance with which bishops, who have been condemned either by Damasus or by other Catholic bishops, and who refuse to submit to their condemnation, or who contumaciously decline to present themselves before the ecclesiastical tribunal when cited, shall be summoned to Rome, "either by the illustrious men, the prefects of the praetorium of your Italy, or by the *vicarius*" (seu ab illustribus viris praefectis praetorio Italiae vestrae, sive a vicario), and shall be under an obligation to obey the summons. Here the point to be noticed is that the prefects of the praetorium of Italy are spoken of in the plural number, while the *vicarius*, by which title is evidently meant the "Vicarius Urbis," is in the singular. If the plural number had been used in connexion with the *vicarius*, as well as in connexion with the prefects, we might have supposed that it was intended

which have no bearing on that point. One would have thought that so very obvious a proceeding did not need explanation.

¹ Even if the great council which met at Rome in the autumn of 382 could have so described itself, yet in a letter addressed to the Emperors, and in a passage setting forth the geographical position of the sees occupied by its members, it would surely have added some allusion to the fact that those members had been convoked by imperial authority. It is S. Jerome who assures us that such was the case (cf. S. Hieron. *Ep. cviii. ad Eustochium Virginem*, § 6, *P. L.*, xxii. 881).

² It was not an uncommon thing for two councils to meet in the same place in the course of one and the same year. In fact, the fifth canon of Nicaea orders two councils in each province, to be held each year; and, similarly, the twentieth canon of Antioch and the thirty-eighth Apostolical canon direct that two provincial councils are to be held each year, one in the fourth week after Easter, and one in October. It happens that the records of the North African Councils have been better preserved than the records of councils in other countries, so that the easiest way of illustrating the fact that the rule, which was embodied in these canons, was put into practice, is by referring to the African conciliar *fasti*. So, for example, in 397 two councils were held in Carthage, one on June 26, and the other on August 28 (Hefele, *E. tr.*, ii. 407). In 401 two councils were also held at Carthage, one on June 16, and the other on September 13 (Hefele, ii. 422, 423). In 408, councils were held at Carthage on June 16 and on October 13 (Hefele, ii. 444). Other examples might be given; but there is no need to prolong this note.

to denote the succession of prefects and the succession of *vicarii*. But as it is, the conclusion is forced upon me that at the time when the synodical letter *Et hoc gloriae vestrae* was written, there was more than one Prefect of the praetorium of Italy.

The question then arises—Is there any evidence that such an arrangement ever existed? And the answer must be in the affirmative. And what is more, it is precisely in the times of Gratian and Valentinian II. that such evidence can be discovered.

Normally, the administration of each of the four praetorian prefectures was committed to one prefect. To this rule there was indeed, for about seventeen years, one very notable exception, arising out of the fact that from 362 until January, 379, the two prefectures of Italy and of Eastern Illyricum were united and were administered by one and the same prefect. But, as far as I am aware, until the latter part of the year 378, or more probably until the earlier part of 379, there had been no instance of one or more prefectures being committed to two prefects acting in common. However, in the middle of the year 379, two prefects are found administering in common the whole Western Empire. The circumstances which led to this exceptional arrangement may be summed up as follows: The young Emperor Gratian, who, by the death of Valens in August, 378, had become for a few months sole acting Emperor, was devoted to his former tutor, the poet Ausonius. Gratian had made Hesperius, the son of Ausonius, Prefect of Italy and Illyricum, in the latter part of 376 or in the beginning of 377;¹ and in the early part of the next year, 378, he made Ausonius himself Prefect of Gaul.² This arrangement seems certainly to have lasted until August, 378, and probably right on into the next year, 379.³ But at some time before July 5, 379,⁴ it must have become clear that, however attractive a tutor Ausonius may have been, he was lacking in the gifts necessary for an administrator, and that some change must be made. At the same time, Gratian was loth to take any step which would seem to cast a slur upon his old friend; he therefore devised, or at any rate sanctioned, a new thing. The prefectures of Italy and of Gaul were united, and the combined prefectures were committed to Ausonius and Hesperius acting together as joint prefects of the whole West.⁵ We may be practically

¹ The name of Hesperius, with the title of prefect, first appears in the Code on January 21, 377 (cf. *Cod. Theod.*, i. 15, 8).

² Ausonius became prefect between January 12, 378 (*Cod. Theod.*, ix. 20, 1), and April 20, 378 (*Cod. Theod.*, viii. 5, 35).

³ The *Gratiarum Actio*, which Ausonius pronounced in the presence of Gratian early in September, 379, implies that in August, 378, when he was designated for the consulate, he was simply Prefect of Gaul (cf. *Auson. Grat. Act.*, viii. 40, *Opuscc.*, ed. Schenkl, p. 24).

⁴ *Cod. Theod.*, xiii. 1, 11. In this law, which is addressed to Hesperius only, a certain provision is made, which is to have force in Italy and in Western Illyricum. The same provision is also to have force in Gaul, but with some modification of the details. This shows that at the date when this law was enacted, viz. on July 5, 379, Hesperius had already had his jurisdiction enlarged so as to cover Gaul as well as Italy.

⁵ In his *Gratiarum Actio* (ii. 7, *Opuscc.*, edit. Schenkl, p. 20) Ausonius says, "Ad praefecturae collegium filius cum patre conjunctus." And a little further on he says, addressing his imperial pupil (ii. 11, p. 21), "Tui tantum praefectura

sure that from that time onward, so long as the new arrangement lasted, Hesperius did almost all the work. If the joint prefecture began in 378, Hesperius' labours must have been somewhat lightened by the cutting off of Eastern Illyricum from the West, in the new partition of the empire which was made by Gratian and Theodosius in January, 379; but my own opinion is that the joint prefecture was subsequent to that partition. The arrangement of the father and son acting as prefects in common was still in force in the early part of September, 379;¹ but before December 3 the prefectures were again separated, Hesperius retaining the administration of Italy, together with Western Illyricum and Africa, while Siburius succeeded to the prefecture of Gaul,² and Ausonius retired once more into private life.

It would seem, therefore, that the plan of joint prefects was introduced into the administration of the Western Empire to meet a particular emergency; but the idea seems to have commended itself to Gratian, and after two years of return to normal methods it was revived again, so far as the prefecture of Italy was concerned. From the beginning of 382 to the close of 386, that is to say, for about five years, there seem to have been regularly two joint prefects administering in common the Italian prefecture. In that prefecture Hesperius had been succeeded by Syagrius some time between March 14, 380,³ and June 18, 380.⁴ Syagrius remained prefect for rather more than two years, and did not retire from his office until some time between July 5, 382,⁵ and August 18, 382.⁶ But before he did so, in the early months of 382, some time before April 1,⁷ Hypatius became his colleague. I have attempted to set forth,

beneficii, quae et ipsa non vult vice simplici gratulari, liberalius divisa quam juncta, cum teneamus duo integrum neuter desiderat separatum." In his *Epicedion in Patrem* (vv. 41, 42, *Opuscc.*, edit. Schenkl, p. 34), Ausonius makes it clear that he had held the prefecture of the praetorium of Italy as well as the prefecture of the praetorium of Gaul. He puts into the mouth of his father a description of his own honours, and makes his father say—

"Maximus ad summum column pervenit honorum,
Praefectus Gallis et Libyae et Latio."

¹ That is to say, at the time when Ausonius pronounced his *Gratiarum Actio* (see the passages quoted in the preceding note).

² *Cod. Theod.*, xi. 31, 7.

³ *Ibid.*, xi. 30, 38.

⁴ *Ibid.*, x. 20, 10.

⁵ *Ibid.*, xii. 1, 89.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ix. 40, 13. In regard to this law, which, according to the two codes of Theodosius and Justinian (cf. *Cod. Just.*, ix. 47, 20), was addressed on August 18, 382, by Gratian, Valentinian II., and Theodosius, "Flaviano Praefecto Praetorio Illyrici [et Italiae]" in *Cod. Theod.*, not in *Cod. Just.*] from Verona, Baronius and Godefroy try to make out that it belongs to the year 390, and that it was enacted by Theodosius after the massacre at Thessalonica. But Pagi has successfully replied to their arguments (*Critica*, ad ann. 390, §§ iv.-ix., edit. 1727, vol. i. pp. 578, 579). If Baronius is right, it would be necessary to change not only the Emperors, the prefect, and the consuls, but also the month and the place. Tillemont (*Empereurs*, v. 721, 722) agrees with Pagi; and Haenel, the critical editor of the Theodosian Code (edit. 1842, col. 939), takes "unhesitatingly" the same view. Seeck (*Chronol. Symmach.*, p. cxvii. adn. 579) tries to revive Baronius' view, but he has been answered by Rauschen (*Jahrbücher*, p. 337, n. 9, and pp. 321, 322). I have no hesitation in accepting the date given by the two codes.

⁷ *Ibid.*, xi. 16, 13. This law was published at Carthage on April 1, 383. It must have been enacted some weeks, if not months, earlier. Gratian was in North Italy during the early part of the year.

in the table given below, the double succession of Italian prefects which followed.

382. SYAGRIUS became prefect between March 14, 380,¹ and June 18, 380.² He ceased to be prefect between July 5, 382,³ and August 18, 382.⁴

FLAVIANUS became prefect, in succession to Syagrius, between July 5, 382,³ and August 18, 382,⁴ and continued prefect through the rest of this year.

383. FLAVIANUS began the year as prefect. He ceased to be prefect between February 27, 383,⁶ and the middle of September⁷ in that year. He was almost certainly still prefect on May 10,⁸ and probably remained in office till early in September.

PROBUS probably became prefect, in succession to Flavianus, in September, 383.⁷ His name first appears in the Code in a law whose true date appears to be January 19, 384.¹¹

HYPATIUS became prefect some time before April 1, 382,⁵ and continued prefect all through this year.

HYPATIUS began the year as prefect. He ceased to be prefect between May 28, 383,⁹ and March 13, 384.¹⁰

ATTICUS became prefect in succession to Hypatius between May 28, 383,⁹ and March 13, 384.¹⁰

¹ See n. 3 on previous page.

² See n. 5 on previous page.

³ See n. 7 on previous page.

⁴ *Cod. Theod.*, vii. 18, 8, and ix. 29, 2.

⁵ There is a letter from Flavianus to Symmachus (*Symmach.*, lib. ii. ep. 6, edit. Seeck, p. 44), written from Campania, after his retirement, when "aestas prope decessit autumnus." I think that he must have fallen into disgrace with Theodosius after Gratian's death on August 25.

⁶ Flavianus' son fell into disgrace with Theodosius, and his fall probably brought about that of his father. But the son was still Proconsul of Asia on May 10 (cf. *Cod. Theod.*, xii. 6, 18). Compare Seeck (*Chronol. Symmach.*, p. cxvii.).

⁷ *Cod. Theod.*, ii. 19, 5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, xiii. 1, 12.

⁹ *Ibid.*, xi. 13, 1. The subscription of this law gives the date, January 19, 383; but Probus cannot have been prefect at that date. No doubt the date has been corrupted by the omission of the words, "post consulatum," a very common mistake of the scribes. The insertion of those words gives the corrected date, 384, which fits in well with another law addressed to Probus on October 26, 384. The inscriptions in honour of Probus, to be found in the *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* (vol. v. pars i. p. 340, n. 3344, and vol. vi. pars i. p. 386, nn. 1751-1753), seem to me to justify Seeck's view (*Chronol. Symmach.*, p. ciii.) that Probus was prefect during part of the years 383 and 384 (see also Socrat., v. 11 and Sozom., vii. 13). Yet Seeck tries to put the law of October 26 back to 383 by the omission of the words, "post consulatum," which are found in the subscription (*Cod. Theod.*, vi. 30, 6), on the ground that ordinarily "post consulatum" is only found

² See n. 4 on previous page.

⁴ See n. 6 on previous page.

384. PROBUS probably began the year as prefect; and was, as it seems to me, certainly prefect on January 19, 384.¹¹ He ceased to be prefect between October 26, 384,¹² and June 1, 385.¹³ He probably remained prefect at least to the end of 384.
- ATTICUS probably began the year as prefect. He was certainly prefect before March 13, 384.¹⁰ He ceased to be prefect between March 13, 384,¹⁰ and May 21, 384.¹⁴
- PRAETEXTATUS became prefect between March 13, 384,¹⁰ and May 21, 384.¹⁴ He died in the autumn, after September 9, 384.¹⁵
- NEOTERIUS probably succeeded Praetextatus in the autumn of 384. He first appears in the Code on February 1, 385.¹⁶
385. PROBUS probably began the year as prefect.
- PRINCIPIUS succeeded him some time before June 1, 385.¹³ He continued prefect through the year.
- NEOTERIUS probably began the year as prefect. He was certainly prefect on February 1, 385.¹⁶ He ceased to be prefect some time between July 10, 385,¹⁷ and January 23, 386.¹⁸
- EUSIGNIUS probably succeeded Neoterius before the end of the year. He first appears as prefect in the Code on January 23, 386.¹⁸
386. PRINCIPIUS continued prefect till near the end of the year, and seems to have had no successor. His name appears in the Code for the last time as prefect on November 3, 386.¹⁹
- EUSIGNIUS probably began the year as prefect. He was certainly prefect before January 23, 386.¹⁸ He continued prefect through the year. His last appearance in the Code was on May 19, 387,²⁰ at which time he was sole prefect in Italy.

I think that the preceding table gives approximately a true view of the double succession of prefects in Italy from 382 to 386. Possibly a more critical investigation of details might lead to some corrections having to be admitted; but the broad fact that there was a double succession during those years cannot, I think, be impugned.

in laws belonging to the first months of the year. However, Rauschen (*Jahrbücher*, p. 82, n. 7) has shown that that rule does not hold in laws belonging to the latter part of the fourth century.

¹² *Cod. Theod.*, vi. 30, 6. ¹³ *Ibid.*, ix. 30, 14. ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, vi. 5, 2.

¹⁵ *Cod. Just.*, i. 54, 5. Praetextatus died after having been nominated by the Emperor as one of the consuls for 385 (cf. S. Hieron. *Lib. contr. Joann. Hierosol.*, cap. 8, *P. L.*, xxiii. 361). See also C.I.L., vol. vi. pars i. pp. 396, 397, nn. 1777 et 1778.

¹⁶ *Cod. Theod.*, viii. 5, 43. The words, "post consulatum," must be inserted into the subscription of this law (cf. Seeck, *Op. cit.*, p. cliv. adn. 785).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, vii. 2, 2.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, xvi. 1, 4, and 4, 1.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, ii. 8, 18; viii. 8, 3; xi. 7, 13.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, xi. 30, 48.

From what I have said it will, I hope, be clear to any reader, who has had the courage to wade through this argument, that it is just possible that there may have been two prefects of the Praetorium of Italy, viz. Ausonius and Hesperius, during at any rate part of the time which elapsed between the death of Valens on August 9, 378, and the accession of Theodosius on January 19, 379; but that it is more probable that the temporary union of the two prefectures and their joint-administration by Ausonius and his son did not commence until after Theodosius' accession, in which case Hesperius must have been sole prefect in Italy during the five months which preceded that accession.

It will, I hope, also be clear that in 382, from April 1 onwards, there were certainly two prefects of the Italian praetorium; and in particular that Syagrius and Hypatius were joint prefects in Italy between April 1 and July 5 in that year.

Lastly, it has, I think, been shown that we have no reason to suppose that in 380 there was ever more than one Italian prefect at any one time. Hesperius was sole prefect in the early part of that year, and Syagrius in the later part.

Unless I am much mistaken, this last result gets rid of Merenda's theory that the synodical letter *Et hoc gloriae vestrae* emanated from the Roman Council of 380. No doubt that theory has been adopted by Hefele and Duchesne; but they do not seem to have noticed the difficulties which attach to it.

The necessity under which we lie, of dating the synodical letter mentioned above, during a time when there was a plurality of prefects in Italy, does not absolutely exclude the theory which assigns the letter to the later months of 378, though it leaves the possibility of that date doubtful. I have, however, given, in an earlier part of this *Excursus*,¹ other reasons which, to my mind, make such a date highly improbable.

On the other hand, all the data of the problem seem to me to be satisfied, if we suppose that a council was held at Rome in May or June of the year 382, and that it was by that council that the letter *Et hoc gloriae vestrae*² was drawn up.

¹ See pp. 518, 519.

² In that letter (§ 5) it is mentioned that Florentius, Bishop of Puteoli, had been condemned and deposed six years before at a Roman synod, and that he has now, "post sextum annum," crept back to his city. The condemnation of Florentius may well be supposed to have taken place at the council held at Rome in the latter half of the year 376 or in the beginning of 377 (for the date, see p. 326, and compare Merenda, *De S. Damasi Opusculis et Gestis*, cap. xi., *P. L.*, xiii. 172-180, and Hefele, *E. tr.*, ii. 290). The name of the Vicarius Urbis, Aquilinus, to whom Gratian's rescript was addressed, does not help to decide the year when the rescript was written. There are gaps in the list of the known names of the Urban Vicars, in 378, 380, and 382. There is nothing to prevent Aquilinus being assigned to any of these years. If my conclusion as to the date of the council is correct, it will follow that he was, in fact, Vicar in the year 382.

EXCURSUS II.

On certain facts and dates connected with the proceedings of Maximus the Cynic in North Italy, which corroborate the conclusion that a council of the province of Milan was held in May, or thereabouts, in the year 381 (see p. 346).

I PROPOSE in this *Excursus* to try and throw some light on certain passages, bearing on the proceedings of Maximus the Cynic in North Italy, which do not seem to me to have been rightly explained hitherto. My reason for dealing with this subject is that, unless I am much mistaken, I shall be able to show that Maximus appeared before a council of the bishops of the province of Milan in the month of May, 381, or thereabouts; and if I only succeed in making this seem probable, I shall have corroborated the conclusion, at which I have arrived on p. 346, that a Milanese council was, in fact, held about that time.¹ Such a corroboration will, I hope, tend to confirm the confidence of readers in the general accuracy of my chronology of the Antiochene compact and of its partial ratification in North Italy. In order to make the discussion comprehensible, it will be necessary to begin by giving a short summary of the grotesque story of Maximus' earlier proceedings.

Towards the end of the year 379, when S. Gregory Nazianzen was acting as a missionary bishop in Constantinople, and was doing his utmost to revive the faith in that Arian city, a strange personage appeared on the scene, one Maximus, an Alexandrian, who "wore the white robe of a Cynic, and carried a philosopher's staff, his head being laden with a huge crop of crisp curling hair, dyed a golden yellow, and swinging over his shoulders in long ringlets."² This personage, in some way or other, gained the heart of the too confiding Gregory, and was admitted to his closest companionship. The saint actually preached a panegyric oration in honour of Maximus and in his presence. But Gregory was nurturing, without knowing it, a viper in his bosom. Maximus was plotting to get himself substituted for his kind host and patron, as bishop of the Catholics in Constantinople. He somehow persuaded his fellow-countryman, Peter of Alexandria, to become his accomplice. Peter, notwithstanding the fact that he had previously written to S. Gregory, recognizing his status as missionary bishop in Constantinople, now sent three of his Egyptian suffragans to consecrate

¹ I use the expression "Milanese council" to denote a council of the bishops of the province, of which Milan was the metropolis. Such a council would usually be held at Milan, but it might on occasion be held at any other city in the province.

² Smith and Wace, *D.C.B.*, iii. 878.

Maximus and intrude him into Gregory's place. One night, when Gregory was ill, they forced their way into the saint's church, the church of the Resurrection, and settled Maximus on the episcopal throne, and began to carry out the rites appointed for the consecration of a bishop. But before they had concluded, daybreak arrived; the plot was discovered; the magistrates arrived on the scene; Maximus and his consecrators were driven into a neighbouring house, the abode of a flute-player, and there the consecration was completed, and the new bishop's tawny locks shorn off. Maximus fled from Constantinople to Thessalonica, to invoke the help and countenance of Theodosius. But the newly baptized Emperor repelled him with great indignation and terrible oaths,¹ and he had to seek refuge with Peter at Alexandria. Here also he created a disturbance, threatening Peter that, if he did not bring about his re-establishment as the Catholic bishop in Constantinople, he would oust him from his own throne. Peter had to appeal to the augustal prefect, who expelled Maximus from the city, and for a time no more was heard of him.

Before passing on to the later history of Maximus, it will be necessary to consider the chronology. The Benedictine editors of the works of S. Gregory Nazianzen, in their *Monitum*² to the Thirty-fourth Oration, express the opinion that Maximus' consecration took place in March or April, 380. This seems to be a very probable date; for Damasus, writing to certain Macedonian bishops in the early part of the year 381,³ says that the consecration took place "at the time when, by God's providence the heretics had been humbled."⁴ This would appear to refer to the period when the law of February 28, 380,⁵ was beginning to take effect throughout the empire. We may suppose that Maximus reached Alexandria not later than the month of June. How long he remained there before he was driven out of that city, and whither he went after his expulsion, we do not know. He disappears from our sight, until he turns up in Milan some time during the Easter-tide of 381;⁶ and soon afterwards we find him present at a council of the bishops of the province of Milan, who take up his cause and write in his favour to Theodosius,

¹ Cf. S. Greg. Naz. *Carmen de Vita sua*, 1010, *Opp.*, ed. Ben., ii. 726.

² S. Greg. Naz. *Opp.*, ed. Ben., i. 618.

³ For the date of Damasus' letters to the Macedonian bishops, see Rauschen (*Jahrbücher*, p. 115).

⁴ *P. L.*, xiii. 565.

⁵ See pp. 334, 335.

⁶ On Easter day, March 28, 381, S. Ambrose wrote the prologue to the first book of his treatise *De Spiritu Sancto*, as will be evident to any one who reads carefully the penultimate paragraph of that prologue (S. Ambros. *Prolog.* in lib. i. *de Spiritu Sancto*, § 17, *P. L.*, xvi. 736, 737) with its clear reference to "these thousand persons" baptized "to-day" at Milan. Now, the last paragraph of the prologue shows that, when S. Ambrose wrote it, he had no doubts about the canonical status of S. Gregory Nazianzen at Constantinople. On the other hand, at the Milanese council, which, as we shall see, was held in May, a few weeks after Easter, S. Ambrose upheld Maximus' claims to the Constantinopolitan see against the claims of S. Gregory. It is clear that Maximus arrived in Milan soon after Easter. It may be well to mention that Peter of Alexandria, who is referred to in the passage mentioned above as if he were alive, had really died on February 14; but the news of his death would not reach Milan until the latter part of April.

apparently intending, if they should receive a reply from the Emperor in time, to come to a decision on his case at the forthcoming Council of Aquileia, which was to be held in September.

I proceed to make good the truth of these last assertions. They are based very largely on what we learn from the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*,¹ addressed to Theodosius by another council of the province of Milan, which was held, as I think, in the last month of the year 381.² In order that my argument may be more easily followed, I will begin by quoting the greater part of the third paragraph, and the whole of the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the letter in question.

After mentioning Nectarius, of whose consecration to the see of Constantinople in succession to S. Gregory Nazianzen the council had lately heard, the letter goes on to say³—

“3. . . Cujus ordinatio quem ordinem habuerit, non videmus. Namque IN CONCILIO NUPER, cum Maximus episcopus Alexandrinae Ecclesiae communionem manere secum lectis Petri sanctae memoriae viri literis prodidisset, ejusque intra privatas aedes, quia Ariani basilicas adhuc tenebant, se creatum esse mandato, tribus episcopis ordinantibus,⁴ dilucida testificatione docuisset, nihil habuimus, beatissimum principum, in quo de episcopatu ejus dubitare possemus, cum vim sibi repugnanti a plerisque etiam de populo et clero testatus esset illatam.

“3. . . We do not see what regularity his [viz. Nectarius'] consecration had. For, IN A COUNCIL LATELY HELD, after Maximus, the bishop, had read a letter of Peter, a man of holy memory, and had made it clear that the communion of the Church of Alexandria remained with him, and had proved by the plainest testimony that he was consecrated in accordance with his [*i.e.* Peter's] mandate in a private house, because the Arians were still at that time in possession of the basilicas, and that three bishops co-operated in his consecration, we had no reason, most blessed Prince, for doubting concerning his episcopal status; [and we felt this all the more,] because he had testified that, when he resisted, force had actually been put upon him by very many of the laity and of the clergy.

¹ It is unfortunate that this letter has been preserved only in one manuscript. We may be morally certain that, if we had other manuscript copies of the letter, we should be able to restore on manuscript evidence to their original form words, which copyists may have altered, and to bring back into the text, on similar evidence, words which copyists may have dropped. Conjectural emendations are much more admissible in such cases as this than they ordinarily are, when the manuscript evidence is abundant in quantity and varied in *provenance*.

² The date of the council, from which the letter *Sanctum animum tuum* emanated, is discussed in note 2 on pp. 538, 539.

³ I give the Latin text in accordance with the single manuscript authority, as it is given by Coleti (ii. 1193, 1194), correcting it, however, in two places, in one of which De Valois and in the other Labbe have suggested emendations which have received the universal approval of later editors. The corrected passages are pointed out in the notes. I take over the division into paragraphs from Migne (*P. L.*, xvi. 991–993), and I punctuate at my own discretion.

⁴ The text of this passage is corrected in accordance with the brilliant conjecture of De Valois (see his note on Sozom. *H. E.*, vii. 9). The manuscript reads, “secretum esse mandatoribus episcopis ordinantibus.”

"4. Tamen ne absentibus partibus praesumpte aliquid definisse videretur, Clementiam tuam datis literis putavimus instruendam, ut ei consuleretur ex usu publicae pacis atque concordiae. Quia revera advertebamus Gregorium nequaquam secundum traditionem patrum Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae sibi sacerdotium vindicare. Nos igitur¹ in synodo ea, quae totius orbis episcopis videbatur esse praescripta,² nihil temere statuendum esse censuimus. At eo ipso tempore,³ qui generale concilium declinaverunt, Constantinopolique⁴ gessisse dicuntur. Nam cum cognovissent ad hoc partium venisse Maximum, ut causam in synodo ageret suam (quod etiamsi indictum concilium non fuisset, jure et more

"4. Still, that we might not appear to have settled anything over-confidently, in the absence of the parties, we thought that information should be furnished to your Clemency by letter, in order that his case might be provided for in such a way as to serve the interests of public peace and concord; because in truth we perceived that in a way quite unauthorized by the tradition of the Fathers, Gregory was claiming for himself the bishopric of the Church of Constantinople. We therefore¹ in that synod, attendance at which appeared to have been prescribed to the bishops of the whole world,² came to the conclusion that nothing ought to be decided rashly. But at that very time³ those who refused to come to the General Council, are reported to have held a council at Constantinople.⁴ Now, after they had become acquainted with the fact that Maximus had come hither to plead his cause in the synod (and this, even if a council had not been convoked, it was competent for him to do lawfully and according to the custom of our pre-

¹ Tillemont's conjectural emendation of this passage will be discussed later (see pp. 536, 537). The text printed and translated here is that of the manuscript.

² The council to which reference is here made is clearly the Council of Aquileia. The bishops of both East and West were originally summoned to that council (cf. *Gest. Concil. Aquil.*, §§ 4-12, *P. L.*, xvi. 956-959). But by the advice of S. Ambrose, Gratian caused fresh letters to be dispatched, which relieved the bishops outside of North Italy from any obligation to attend, while they left them free to come if they wished. The council itself, in its letter *Benedictus Deus* (§ 3, *P. L.*, xvi. 981), describes what actually happened. The Aquileian Fathers say, "Though owing to the distance of the journey they [viz. the bishops of 'the churches over the whole world'] could not come personally, yet nearly all from all the Western provinces were present by the legates who were sent."

³ The text of this clause is corrected in accordance with Labbe's conjecture. The manuscript reads, "Adeo ipso tempore."

⁴ There must be something corrupt in this passage. Either the "que" should be erased or some words have dropped out after "dicuntur." In translating I have ignored the "que." Hardouin suggests the substitution of "quae" for "que,"³ but that emendation does not seem to help the sense. [Since the earlier part of this note was written, my friend, Mr. C. H. Turner, of Magdalen, has suggested to me that in lieu of "Constantinopolique gessisse" we should read "Constantinopoli inique gessisse." This makes excellent sense, and very much improves the connexion of this sentence with that which follows. This letter was probably written by S. Ambrose, and I observe that S. Ambrose, when he recited Ps. cxviii. 78, was accustomed to say, "quoniam injuste iniquitatem gesserunt in me;" and in his exposition of that verse he says, "Numquid hic maledicit qui in se iniqua gesserunt?" (*Expos. in Ps. cxviii.*, Sermon. x. § 41, *P. L.*, xv. 1416). If Mr. Turner's emendation is accepted, the "nam" which follows "dicuntur" should be translated "for" instead of "now."]

majorum,¹ sicut et sanctae memoriae Athanasius, et dudum Petrus, Alexandrinae ecclesiae episcopi, et orientalium plerique fecerunt, ut ad ecclesiae Romanae, Italiae et totius occidentis confugisse iudicium viderentur); cum eum, sicut diximus, experiri velle adversum eos qui episcopatum ejus abnuentur comperissent, praestolari utique etiam nostram super eo sententiam debuerunt. Non praerogativam vindicamus examinis,² sed consortium tamen debuit esse communis arbitrii.

"5. Postremo prius constare oportuit, utrum huic abrogandum, quam alii conferendum sacerdotium videretur, ab his praesertim, a quibus se Maximus vel destitutum, vel appetitum injuria querebatur. Itaque cum Maximum episcopum receperunt³ in communionem nostra consortia, quoniam eum a Catholicis constitit episcopis ordinatum, nec ab episco-

decessors,¹ as also Athanasius of holy memory, and quite lately Peter, both of them bishops of the Church of Alexandria, and a considerable number of Easterns have done, so that they appeared to have had recourse to the decision of the churches of Rome, of Italy, and of all the West); after they had ascertained, as we said, that Maximus wished to bring to a formal issue the question raised by those who denied his episcopal status, they were surely bound to have waited for our judgement about him. We do not claim that the right of examination belongs to us as a peculiar privilege,² but we ought to have had a share in what should be a common decision.

"5. Last of all it ought to have been decided whether it was right that the bishopric should be taken away from Maximus, before it was decided that it ought to be conferred on another, especially since those who conferred it were persons, concerning whom Maximus was complaining that he had been either abandoned by them or assailed by them with violence. Therefore since we and the bishops, who are our colleagues, have received³ Maximus the bishop into our communion on the ground that it was

¹ It is clear that here also the text is corrupt. Some such words as "facere potuisset" have dropped out. In translating I have corrected the text in accordance with my proposed emendation.

² Dr. Rivington (*Prim. Ch.*, pp. 478, 479) insists that the expression "praerogativam examinis" in this passage must mean "the examination of the matter in the first instance," because of the technical meaning attached to the word *praerogativa*, when used of the tribe or century which on any occasion had to vote first in the Roman *Comitia*. But is the word *praerogativa* ever used of a court of first instance? It is a favourite word with S. Ambrose, who uses it in the sense of "privilege." Cf. S. Ambros. *Enarr. in Ps. xliii.* § 13 (*P. L.*, xiv. 1149); *Expos. in Ps. cxviii.*, Sermon. ii. § 14 (*P. L.*, xv. 1279); *Prolog. in lib. i. de Spir. Sanct.*, § 17 (*P. L.*, xvi. 736); *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xii. § 4 (*P. L.*, xvi. 989); and compare the synodical letter, *Et hoc Gloriam Vestrae*, § 10 (*P. L.*, xiii. 582). This synodical letter belongs, as has been shown, to the year 382, and may have been written by S. Ambrose.

³ It would appear that this reception of Maximus into the communion of the North Italian bishops took place at the "concilium nuper." That council recognized his episcopal status; the bishops expressly say (§ 3) that they had no reason in that council for doubting about it, though the further question of his right to the see of Constantinople was reserved. This note will be better understood, after the reader has digested the discussion, which follows, and deals with the meaning of the whole passage.

patus Constantinopolitani putavimus petitione removendum. Cujus allegationem praesentibus partibus aestimavimus esse pendendam. Nectarium autem cum nuper nostra mediocritas Constantinopoli cognoverit ordinatum, cohaerere communionem nostram cum orientalibus partibus non videmus. Praesertim cum ab iisdem Nectarius dicitur illico sine communionis consortio destitutus, a quibus fuerat ordinatus."¹

certain that he had been consecrated by Catholic bishops, we also came to the conclusion that he ought not to be excluded from his right of claim to the bishopric of Constantinople. And we held that his argument in proof of his claim should be weighed in the presence of both parties. But since we have learnt recently that Nectarius has been consecrated at Constantinople, we do not see that our communion with the Eastern regions stands firm; especially since Nectarius is said to have been left without the fellowship of communion immediately [after his consecration] by the very persons who had consecrated him."¹

I have, I hope, made it clear in note 2 on p. 532, that the council, which, when it was originally convoked, was intended to be an Ecumenical Council, and to which allusion is made in the fourth paragraph of the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, quoted above, was in fact the Council of Aquileia. But the question now arises: Are we to identify this council with the council previously mentioned, as having been "lately held" (*concilio nuper*), before which Maximus appeared, and to which he read or caused to be read the letter of Peter of Alexandria in his favour, and which finally addressed a letter to Theodosius in defence of Maximus' claims to the see of Constantinople as against the claims of S. Gregory Nazianzen? or are we to regard the *concilium nuper* as having been held some months before the Council of Aquileia? Some arguments at once suggest themselves in favour of distinguishing between the two councils.

1. If the two councils are to be identified, why does S. Ambrose, when he first mentions this council in the third paragraph, refer to it simply as a *concilium nuper*; while later on, after giving an elaborate account of what had happened at it, having occasion to make explicit mention of it again in the fourth paragraph, he, without any apparent reason, gives a full description of it as having been originally intended to be an Ecumenical Council? The natural mode of proceeding, if the two passages refer to the same council, would have been to give the full description of the council when it was first mentioned. It is impossible to read consecutively the third and fourth paragraphs without feeling that the full description seems to be inserted in the fourth paragraph, in order to distinguish the council so described from the council previously mentioned.

2. We have a full series of documents connected with the Council of Aquileia, namely, the *Gesta Concilii* and also four synodical epistles, that is to say—one to the bishops of certain provinces in Gaul, two to the Emperor Gratian, and one to the Emperor Theodosius. But the letter in favour of Maximus, addressed to Theodosius by the *concilium nuper*, is not to be found in the Aquileian collection. It is surprising that so

¹ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xiii. §§ 3-5, *P. L.*, xvi. 991-993.

important a letter, if it really was written by the Council of Aquileia, should have dropped out.

3. S. Ambrose, in the fourth paragraph of the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, lays very great stress on the fact that the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) *knew* that Maximus had come to Italy to plead his cause before the Council of Aquileia. Twice over he repeats that the Constantinopolitan Council had "become acquainted with that fact" and had "ascertained" it. And it is on the basis of their *knowledge* of Maximus being in the West, waiting to plead before a council which had been convoked, that S. Ambrose and his suffragans rest their censure of the Constantinopolitan Fathers, who ought, in the opinion of the Italian bishops, to have waited to learn the judgement of the West on Maximus' claims before they consecrated and enthroned Nectarius. The most elementary sense of propriety would move S. Ambrose when complaining to an Emperor about the action of a council, which that Emperor had convoked and ratified, to bring forward some proof of the allegation on which he principally based his censure. One would expect to find in an earlier part of the letter, *Sanctum animum tuum*, a clear reference to some letter sent from North Italy to Constantinople, which should have arrived before the close of the Constantinopolitan Council, and which, even if it made no explicit reference to the forthcoming Council of Aquileia, should at least have explained the position of Maximus as having come to the West, and as having put himself in communication with certain of the Western bishops, and as being at the time, when the letter was sent, in a state of expectation, awaiting their decision upon his claims. Now, if the *concilium nuper* is a distinct council from the Council of Aquileia, we have in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph of the letter *Sanctum animum tuum* such a reference to a letter of advice, sent from North Italy to Constantinople, as would constitute a solid foundation for S. Ambrose's repeated allusions to the knowledge of Maximus' position, which was possessed by the Constantinopolitan Council. But if the *concilium nuper* and the Council of Aquileia are to be identified, we have no such reference; for in that case the letter to Theodosius, described in the first sentence of the before-mentioned fourth paragraph, must have been written from Aquileia more than a month after the Council of Constantinople had been brought to a close.

On the whole these three arguments, and more especially the last, appear to me to be so strong that, even if I were forced to accept the text of the fourth paragraph, as it is found in the single manuscript which has preserved it, I should myself feel no doubt that the *concilium nuper* is to be distinguished from the Council of Aquileia, and that it was in fact a council held some months before the Council of Aquileia.¹

¹ To some readers the distinction between the *concilium nuper* and the Aquileian Council might seem to be proved by the fact that the *concilium nuper* defended the claims of Maximus *against the claims of S. Gregory Nazianzen*, making no mention of the claims of Nectarius. They would point out that S. Gregory had resigned the see of Constantinople in June or early in July, and that Nectarius had succeeded him certainly before the end of July; and they would therefore urge that it was impossible to suppose that the council, which made no mention of Nectarius and confined its attention to Gregory, is to be

But at this point it becomes necessary to call attention to a difficulty, which is inherent in the manuscript text, and which is not affected by the way in which the question as to the identity or non-identity of the *concilium nuper* with the Aquileian Council may be decided. According to the manuscript text S. Ambrose and his comprovincials write :—"We therefore in that synod—attendance at which appeared to have been prescribed to the bishops of the whole world—came to the conclusion that nothing ought to be decided rashly. But at that very time those who refused to come to the general council are reported to have held a council at Constantinople." Now, the second of these two sentences, when taken in connexion with the first, seems to assert that the Council of Constantinople was held at the very time when the Council of Aquileia was being held. But further on in the same paragraph it is implied that the Council of Constantinople had been informed that Maximus was waiting to plead his cause before the Council of Aquileia, and it is laid down that the Eastern bishops ought to have waited for the decision of Aquileia before they took any final action of their own to his detriment. And, as a matter of fact, the Council of Constantinople was commenced more than three months before the Council of Aquileia, and had been brought to a close more than a month, perhaps nearly two months, before the opening of that Western synod. Thus the two sentences, which are quoted above, palpably contradict, as they stand, the facts of history, and are irreconcilable with statements made further on in the same paragraph, in which they themselves find a place. Clearly there must be some corruption in the text.

I have no doubt myself that a word has dropped out. In fact, the whole of our difficulties will be avoided, and we shall succeed in getting a consistent statement, if an emendation of Tillemont's be adopted, and the word "nisi" be inserted before the words "in synodo ea."¹ The

identified with the Council of Aquileia, which was held in September. I entirely agree with the conclusion, but I cannot accept that particular argument in its favour. The Aquileian letters make it perfectly clear that the events, which had occurred in Constantinople during the summer, were not known in Aquileia, when the council met there in September.

¹ Tillemont (ix. 501) quotes the fourth paragraph of the letter *Sanctum animum tuum* in his margin thus "(nisi) in synodo ea, etc." He does not argue in favour of his emendation, but assumes it, as apparently not needing any justification, and he bases his whole reading of the history on the sentence so amended. As a result of his insertion of the word "nisi," he distinguishes the *concilium nuper* from the council which was originally intended to be ecumenical. He thinks that the *concilium nuper* was held in March, April, or May, and that the council, intended to be ecumenical, was held at the end of the year. Tillemont's whole account labours under one great defect, produced by the fact that he assigns all these events to the year 382, whereas they really happened in 381. But his weighty opinion in favour of the insertion of "nisi," and his general interpretation of the third and fourth paragraphs of the letter *Sanctum animum tuum* are not vitiated by his chronological mistake. Owing to that mistake he identifies the council, which was originally intended to be ecumenical, with the Council of Rome, which was held in the autumn of 382. If the *concilium nuper* had been held in May, 382, instead of in May, 381, it would have attacked the claims of Nectarius to the see of Constantinople rather than the claims of S. Gregory Nazianzen. For parallels to such a use of *nisi* as Tillemont proposes, one may refer to Gal. ii. 16, Apoc. xxi. 27, and other passages of the New Testament in the Vulgate. Compare also Pope Stephen's words, "Nihil

first of the sentences, quoted above, will then convey a meaning which may be thus expressed: "We therefore came to the conclusion that nothing should be rashly decided, but that the decision should be reserved for that synod, attendance at which appeared to have been prescribed to the bishops of the whole world."

If that correction be admitted, all becomes clear. A sharp distinction is made between the *concilium nuper* and the Council of Aquileia; and the meeting of the Council of Constantinople is stated to have taken place at the very time when the *concilium nuper* was being held, and not, as the manuscript reading implies, at the time when the Council of Aquileia was in session. As we know that the Council of Constantinople assembled in the month of May, we may conclude that it was in May or thereabouts that the *concilium nuper* was held.

I hope that I have succeeded in showing that the chronology of the events connected with the story of Maximus confirms very remarkably the result, at which we had previously arrived, when we were considering such information as we possess concerning the reception of the news of the Antiochene compact in the West. The two lines of investigation are independent of each other, but they agree in pointing to the conclusion that a provincial council was held in North Italy in May or June, 381, and that a letter was addressed by that council to Theodosius. We can now see that two subjects were discussed in the council's letter, namely, (1) the ratification¹ of the Antiochene compact,² and (2) the claims of

innovetur nisi quod traditum est," quoted by S. Cyprian (*Ep.* lxxiv. § 1, *Opp.*, ed. Hartel., i. 799), and S. Cyprian's own words in his *Ep.* lxiii. *ad Caecilium*, § 13 (*Opp.*, i. 712, 3, 5), and see Archbishop Benson's note (*Cyprian*, pp. 421, 422). One may compare also the words of the five legates of Pope Hormisdas, who were sent to Constantinople in 519, and who, in a *suggestio* addressed to the pope, describe a service held at Scampes thus:—"Celebratae sunt missae; nullius nomen obnoxium religionis est recitatum, nisi tantum beatitudinis vestrae" (*P. L.*, lxiii. 442). [Since the previous portion of this note was written, Mr. C. H. Turner has again come to my help with what seems to me a most satisfactory emendation of the text. He suggests that in lieu of the words, "nos igitur (nisi) in synodo," we should read, "nisi igitur in synodo." It is clear that "nisi igitur" could very easily get corrupted into "nos igitur." The reader will see at once that Mr. Turner's emendation gives to the sentence the same meaning as the less elegant emendation of Tillemont.]

¹ See pp. 344, 345.

² In the second paragraph of the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, a paragraph to which I have not hitherto alluded, there is a plain reference to this first section of the synodical letter addressed to Theodosius by the Milanese council held in May, 381. For the sake of completeness I quote the passage: "We wrote to you not long ago (*scripseramus dudum*), that, since the city of Antioch had two bishops, Paulinus and Meletius, both of whom we regarded as true to the faith, there should be agreement between them in respect to peace and concord without violation of ecclesiastical order, or at least that, if one of them died before the other, no one should be put into the place of the deceased while the other lived." From what has been said it will now be evident to the reader that, when S. Ambrose and his suffragans used the expression "*Scripseramus dudum*" in their second paragraph, they were referring to a letter, written at the same North Italian synod, as the synod to which they allude in their third paragraph in the words, "in concilio nuper;" and again they were also referring to the same letter as that, to which allusion is made by the Aquileian Fathers, when in their letter *Quamlibet* (§ 5, quoted on p. 345, note 1), they speak of "preces nostras, quibus juxta partium pactum poposcimus," etc.

Maximus the Cynic to the see of Constantinople. The different fragments of information fit in together like the pieces in a Chinese puzzle ; and the truth of the separate testimonies is corroborated by their mutual harmony.

Although it is not strictly necessary to my argument, I venture to set down here what I have been able to gather, or probably conjecture, about the issue of the controversy in regard to Maximus. We have seen that at the preliminary council in May, 381, Maximus was received into communion, but that nothing was definitely decided as to his claim to the see of Constantinople. The final decision on that point was postponed until the Council of Aquileia should meet. When the Council of Aquileia did meet, it is clear that no reply had been received from Theodosius. He could hardly have replied without giving some information about the Council of Constantinople, and about its condemnation of Maximus and its appointment of Nectarius. But the Fathers of Aquileia show no signs of having ever heard of the Council of Constantinople or any of its proceedings. Accordingly, the bishops at Aquileia again postponed any final decision in regard to Maximus' right to the see of Constantinople. When at last Theodosius' reply arrived, as no doubt it did arrive, the bishops of North Italy must have discovered that from their point of view everything had gone wrong in regard to the controversy about Maximus at the Council of Constantinople. That council had condemned Maximus, and had established Nectarius as successor to S. Gregory in the see of the imperial city. It may be presumed that soon afterwards another letter from Theodosius arrived, replying to the letter *Quamlibet* addressed to him by the Council of Aquileia. It is clear that either from it or from some other trustworthy source S. Ambrose and his suffragans learnt that Theodosius had no intention of summoning an Ecumenical Council at Alexandria.¹ The state of things must have seemed to S. Ambrose to be getting very serious, and he thought it right to summon a fresh council to meet, presumably at Milan, some time in the closing weeks of the year 381, most probably, as it seems to me, during December.² At that council he drew up and sent to Theodosius the

¹ In their letter *Sanctum animum tuum* they say nothing about a council at Alexandria, although they are writing to Theodosius ; but they speak of a proposed council to be held at Rome. Some communications must have passed on the subject of the formal request of the Aquileian Council that there should be a council summoned to meet at Alexandria (cf. *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xii. § 5, *P. L.*, xvi. 989). The proposal to hold a council at Rome implies, I think, that the crisis in that city was terminated. Gratian had no doubt decided in favour of Damasus and had banished Ursinus and Isaac.

² As regards the date of the Milanese council, which sent the letter *Sanctum animum tuum* to Theodosius, the following considerations ought to be taken into account. (1) This council was obviously later than the Council of Aquileia, and it must be assigned to a date removed sufficiently from the date of the Aquileian Council to allow of the Aquileian letter *Quamlibet* reaching Theodosius, and of the Eastern Emperor's reply to that letter being received at Milan. (2) On the other hand, the interval between the two councils must not be made longer than would be necessary for the above-mentioned correspondence to take place ; because we have to find room in the year 382 for three other councils, all of which were attended by the bishops of North Italy. For in the first place, there was held in

strong letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, part of which we have been considering. Towards the end of that letter the bishops of North Italy threaten to break off all relations with the Eastern Church, unless Maximus is reinstated in the Constantinopolitan see, or unless the East will agree that the whole matter shall be brought before a General Council, to meet in Rome. It would seem that the writers had reason to think that their own Emperor, Gratian, would be ready to convoke the proposed council, as in fact he did.¹ They mention that it is at Gratian's suggestion that they are writing on these subjects to Theodosius.²

To this letter Theodosius returned, to use S. Ambrose's expression, an "august and princely answer," which has not come down to us. A fresh council of the province of Milan was held in the year 382,³ which sent a suitable reply to the Emperor's letter. That reply, beginning with the words *Fidei tuæ*, we possess.⁴ We may gather from it that Theodosius had written about the two controversies, which had been discussed in the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, that is to say, the controversy as to which of the two claimants, S. Flavian or Paulinus, had the best right to the see of Antioch, and the similar controversy in regard to the rival claims of Nectarius and Maximus to the see of Constantinople.⁵ S. Ambrose and his colleagues say nothing which suggests that the Emperor's letter had in any way caused them to change their opinion in reference to either of those controversies. We know for certain that they, with the rest of the West, continued to support the claims of Paulinus at Antioch, and we may, I think, fairly presume that they continued to support Maximus' claims to the see of Constantinople.

But not many weeks afterwards they, or some of them, must have gone to Rome to attend the council which synodically judged and acquitted Damasus, and they were no doubt disabused, by intercourse with Damasus and others, of the favourable view of Maximus' claims which they had too readily adopted in consequence of their having given an undeserved credence to the tale of that impostor. They would

the earlier part of that year another council of the bishops of the province of Milan, which addressed to Theodosius the letter *Fidei tuæ* (see the note on p. 380). Secondly, there was held at Rome a council attended by "almost innumerable bishops from the different parts of Italy," which synodically acquitted Damasus (see the *Excursus* I. on pp. 510-528, and refer specially to p. 523). And thirdly, there was the great council held at Rome in the autumn, which was originally intended to be an Ecumenical Council (see p. 522). These considerations seem to me to point to the closing weeks of the year 381 as the probable date of the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, though it might conceivably have been written in January, 382.

¹ Compare p. 523, note 1; and compare also Theodoret (*H. E.*, v. 9) and Sozomen (*H. E.*, vii. 11).

² Cf. *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xiii. §§ 6-8, *P. L.* xvi. 993.

³ Easter fell on April 17 in the year 382. I am inclined to think that the Milanese council, to which reference is made in the text, was held as soon as possible after Easter.

⁴ *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xiv., *P. L.*, xvi. 994, 995.

⁵ The Benedictine editors of the works of S. Ambrose express their opinion that Theodosius in his "august and princely answer" "et seriem qua Nectarii facta est ordinatio, non secus ac Maximi dolos ac scelera significasse, sicut et quæ ad Paulini ac Flaviani causam pertinebant." This conclusion seems to result from a comparison of the two synodical letters *Fidei tuæ* and *Sanctum animum tuum*.

discover that Rome, Alexandria, and the East were at one in rejecting Maximus' pretensions, though, for the present, Rome was still doubtful about the canonical status of Nectarius.

The whole history of the support of Maximus' claims by S. Ambrose and his suffragans is of great interest, because it shows how very independent of Rome the see of Milan was in S. Ambrose's time. Damasus had been informed by S. Acholius of Thessalonica, perhaps as early as the year 380, of the baseless nature of Maximus' claims; and he had written strongly against Maximus some time in the first two or three months of 381. But S. Ambrose was supporting Maximus all through the year 381, from Easter or thereabouts onwards, holding synods, and writing to Theodosius in Maximus' favour, and claiming a substantial share in the settlement of the question, and threatening to withdraw his communion from the East if they persisted in regarding their condemnation of Maximus as final. It is clear that he did not think that it was in any way necessary that he should consult Damasus before taking these measures.

Of course S. Ambrose recognized that the Apostolic see of imperial Rome was, as a matter of fact, first in order among the sees of the West and in the whole Church; ¹ and he was prepared at the present juncture to grant to that see through the medium of State legislation certain carefully defined judicial powers in relation to Western bishops and metropolitans. But, as Mgr. Duchesne has told us, there was practically at that time in the West "a double hegemony; that of the pope and that of the Bishop of Milan;" ² and S. Ambrose had no idea of merging that double hegemony into the single hegemony of the pope. ³

In the particular case of Maximus, the pope, thanks to S. Acholius, had been better informed than the Bishop of Milan. But that accidental fact does not diminish the interest which attaches to S. Ambrose's view of his own position face to face with the occupant of the Roman see.

¹ Just because the Roman see was, in fact, the first see, it necessarily was the normal centre, which was in continual communication with all parts of the Church. So long as it remained the first see, to enjoy the communion of Rome would under normal circumstances carry with it the enjoyment of the communion of all other Catholic churches. It was, therefore, natural for the Western Council of Aquileia to speak of "the rights of venerable communion flowing forth to all" from the Church of Rome (cf. *Ep. inter Ambrosianas* xi. § 4, *P. L.*, xvi. 986). A similar remark concerning the see of Canterbury might be made at the present time by an English Churchman, who should be speaking of that primatial church in its relation to other churches of the Anglican communion. But neither in the fourth century nor now would it be necessarily implied that such a position rested on any immutable divine sanction, or that it carried with it any monarchical jurisdiction.

² Compare Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 32.

³ From what has been set forth in this *Excursus* it will be seen how curiously mistaken Dr. Rivington was, in thinking (see *Prim. Ch.*, p. 478) that, when S. Ambrose and his colleagues tell Theodosius in their letter *Sanctum animum tuum* that, since Maximus was pleading his cause in the West, the Easterns "ought to have waited for our judgement concerning him," "they certainly meant" "that the Easterns ought to have waited for the judgement of Rome." They assuredly meant nothing of the kind. There are occasions in the course of the history of the Early Church, when the expression "the West" may be regarded as practically almost equivalent to "Rome"; but it would be a great mistake to treat the two expressions as if ordinarily they were interchangeable.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF ECCLESIASTICAL EVENTS BELONGING
TO THE YEARS 381 AND 382.

(To illustrate *Excursus I.* and *Excursus II.*)

A.D. 381.

- | | |
|---|--|
| Theodosius publishes his constitution— <i>Nullus Haereticis.</i> | January 10 (see p. 336). |
| Sapor arrives in Antioch. | Probably at the beginning of February (see p. 337). |
| Peter of Alexandria dies. | February 14 (see note 4 on p. 337). |
| The compact is made between S. Meletius and Paulinus. | Probably during the second half of February (see pp. 343, 344). |
| S. Ambrose writes the prologue to his Lib. i. <i>de Spiritu Sancto.</i> | On Easter day, March 28 (see p. 530, note 6). |
| Damasus writes to some Macedonian bishops against Maximus. | Some time during the first three months in the year (see p. 530). |
| Maximus arrives in Milan. | Soon after Easter (see p. 530). |
| S. Meletius' envoys arrive in Milan. | Probably during the first three weeks in May (see pp. 343, 344). |
| A Milanese council is held, which writes to Theodosius about the Antiochene compact, and in favour of Maximus. This is the <i>concilium nuper</i> (see p. 531). | In the latter part of May, or at latest, in the first week of June (see pp. 345, 537). |
| The Second Ecumenical Council meets at Constantinople. | Certainly in May; probably in the latter part of that month (see p. 345). |
| S. Meletius dies. | Perhaps early in June. |
| The Ecumenical Council passes its canons. | Perhaps on July 9 (cf. Mansi, iii. 557). |
| Nectarius is consecrated. | Probably in July; certainly before July 30 (see p. 335, note 3). |
| Theodosius publishes his constitution— <i>Episcopis tradi.</i> | July 30 (see p. 335, note 3). |
| The Roman Church is very seriously disturbed by the machinations of Ursinus' emissaries. | During the spring and summer months (see pp. 342, 343, 519-521). |
| The charge against Damasus is investigated by the Prefect of the City. | Probably during July (see p. 520). |
| The Council of Aquileia meets. | September 3 (see p. 514). |
| Gratian acquits Damasus and banishes Ursinus to Cologne, and Isaac the Jew to a corner of Spain. | Before December (see p. 538, note 1). |
| A Milanese council addresses the letter <i>Sanctum animum tuum</i> to Theodosius. | Probably during December, but possibly in January, 382 (see note 2 on pp. 538, 539). |

- A.D. 382.
Easter day. April 17.
- A Milanese council addresses the letter *Fidei tuæ* to Theodosius. Probably towards the end of April (see p. 539 note 3).
- A council of all Italy meets in Rome, and synodically acquits Damasus, and addresses the letter *Et hoc Gloriæ Vestrae* to Gratian. At the end of May or in June (see p. 523).
- An Eastern council at Constantinople addresses the synodical letter (*Τὸ μὲν ὡς ἀγνοῦσαν*) to the Western bishops. In the summer (see p. 522).
- Gratian sends his rescript *Ordinatio-
riorum sententia* to Aquilinus. Probably in July or August.
- A great council, intended to be ecumenical, but to which only five Eastern bishops come, is held in Rome. In the autumn (see p. 522).

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE COUNCILS TO WHICH
REFERENCE IS MADE IN THIS VOLUME.

- A.D. (*circa*) 50, Jerusalem, under S. James.
 (*circa*) 195, Caesarea, under S. Theophilus and S. Narcissus.
 (*circa*) 195, Ephesus, under Polycrates of Ephesus.
 (*circa*) 195, Rome, under Victor of Rome.
 (*circa*) 215, Carthage, under Agrippinus of Carthage.
 230, Iconium.
 251, Carthage, first under S. Cyprian of Carthage.
 254 or 255, Carthage, fourth under S. Cyprian.
 256 (spring), Carthage, sixth under S. Cyprian.
 256 (September), Carthage, seventh under S. Cyprian.
 268, Antioch, under Helenus of Tarsus.
 300, Elvira, under Felix of Acci.
 313, Rome, under S. Miltiades of Rome.
 314, Arles, under Marinus of Arles.
 320 or 321, Alexandria, under S. Alexander of Alexandria.
 324, Alexandria, under Hosius of Cordova.
 325, Nicaea, under Hosius, First Ecumenical.
 335, Tyre, under Eusebius of Caesarea [?].
 339, Antioch.
 340, Antioch.
 341, Antioch (Council of the Dedication).
 343, Sardica, under Hosius.
 343, Philippopolis, under Stephen of Antioch.

- Soon after 343, Carthage, under S. Gratus of Carthage.
 344, Antioch.
 345, Milan.
 351, Sirmium.
 353, Arles.
 355, Milan.
 357, Sirmium.
 357, Melitene.
 358, Ancyra, under Basil of Ancyra.
 358, Sirmium.
 359 (May), Sirmium.
 359, Ariminum, under Restitutus of Carthage.
 359, Seleucia.
 360, Constantinople, under Acacius of Caesarea.
 361, Antioch.
 362, Alexandria, under S. Athanasius of Alexandria.
 363, Antioch, under S. Meletius of Antioch.
 364, Lampsacus.
 367, Tyana.
 371 (December), Rome, second under Damasus of Rome.¹
 374, Rome, third under Damasus.
 374, Valence.
 375, in Western Illyricum.
 376 or 377, Rome, fourth under Damasus.
 379, Antioch, under S. Meletius.
 380, Rome, fifth under Damasus.
 381 (May), Constantinople I., under S. Meletius, S. Gregory Nazianzen, and Nectarius, Second Ecumenical.
 381 (May or June), Milan, under S. Ambrose of Milan.
 381 (September), Aquileia, under S. Valerian and S. Ambrose.
 381 (December), Milan, under S. Ambrose.
 382 (April), Milan, under S. Ambrose.
 382 (May or June), Rome, sixth under Damasus.
 382 (Summer), Constantinople, under Nectarius.
 382 (Autumn), Rome, seventh under Damasus.
 390, Carthage, under Genethlius of Carthage.
 391-2, Capua.
 394, Constantinople, under Nectarius.
 397 (June), Carthage, second under S. Aurelius of Carthage.
 397 (August), Carthage, third under S. Aurelius.
 398 (September), Turin.
 401 (June), Carthage, fifth under S. Aurelius.
 401 (September), Carthage, sixth under S. Aurelius.

¹ I agree with Dr. Bright in thinking that this was "the second of Damasus' councils" (*Later Treatises of S. Athanasius*, p. 45). It was apparently at this council that Auxentius of Milan was anathematized (Bright, *Op. cit.*, p. 43, and cf. S. Athanas. *Ep. ad Epictetum*, § 1). There had been an earlier council in or about 369, at which Ursacius and Valens had been cast out of the Church, but Auxentius had apparently been spared (cf. S. Athanas. *Ep. ad Afros*, § 10, and compare Bright, *Op. cit.*, p. 40).

- A.D. 404, Carthage, ninth under S. Aurelius.
 407, Carthage, eleventh under S. Aurelius.
 408 (June), Carthage, twelfth under S. Aurelius.
 408 (October), Carthage, thirteenth under S. Aurelius.
 412, Zerta.
 415, Diospolis, under Eulogius of Caesarea.
 416, Carthage, under S. Aurelius.¹
 416, Mileum, under Silvanus, the Primate of Numidia.
 418 (May), Carthage, sixteenth under S. Aurelius.
 418, Telepte.
 418 (December), Carthage, under S. Aurelius.²
 419 (May), Carthage, seventeenth under S. Aurelius.
 421, Carthage, eighteenth under S. Aurelius.
 (circa) 423, Carthage, nineteenth under S. Aurelius.
 426, Carthage, twentieth under S. Aurelius.
 431, Ephesus, under S. Cyril of Alexandria, Third Ecumenical.
 442, Vaison.
 444, Besançon, under S. Hilary of Arles.
 448, Constantinople, under S. Flavian of Constantinople.
 449 (August), Ephesus, under Dioscorus of Alexandria, the *Latrocinium*.
 449 (October), Rome, under S. Leo of Rome.
 451, Chalcedon, under S. Leo's legates, Fourth Ecumenical.
 484, Rome, under Felix III. of Rome.
 485, Rome, under Felix III.
 495, Rome, under Gelasius of Rome.
 518, Jerusalem, under John III. of Jerusalem.
 518, Tyre, under Epiphanius of Tyre.
 518, Constantinople, under John II. of Constantinople.
 525, Carthage, under Boniface of Carthage.
 531, Rome, under Boniface II. of Rome.
 535, Carthage, under Reparatus of Carthage.
 536, Constantinople, under S. Mennas of Constantinople.
 550, Carthage, under Reparatus.
 553, Constantinople II., under S. Eutychius, Fifth Ecumenical.
 680, Constantinople III., under Agatho's legates, Sixth Ecumenical.
 691, *in Trullo*, under Paul III. of Constantinople.
 743, Rome, under Zacharias of Rome.
 787, Nicaea II.
 826, Rome.
 833, Compiègne.
 844, Thionville.
 845, Meaux.
 1869, 1870, Vatican, under Pius IX. of Rome.

¹ A provincial council of the Proconsularis.

² Probably a provincial council of the Proconsularis.

CATALOGUE OF THE NAMES OF THE BISHOPS OF
ROME DURING THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES AFTER
CHRIST.

N.B.—The names of Roman bishops, who are not elsewhere mentioned in this volume, are printed in italics.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Linus. | 33. <i>Marcus</i> (Jan. 336–Oct. 336). |
| 2. Anencletus. | 34. Julius (A.D. 337–352). |
| 3. Clement (A.D. 91–99). | 35. Liberius (A.D. 352–366). |
| 4. Evaristus (A.D. 99–109). | 36. Felix II. (A.D. 356–365). |
| 5. Alexander (A.D. 109–119). | 37. Damasus (A.D. 366–384). |
| 6. Xystus I. (A.D. 119–128). | 38. Siricius (A.D. 384–398). |
| 7. Telesphorus (A.D. 128–138). | 39. Anastasius I. (A.D. 398–402). |
| 8. Hyginus (A.D. 138–142). | 40. Innocent I. (A.D. 402–417). |
| 9. Pius I. (A.D. 142–154). | 41. Zosimus (A.D. 417–418). |
| 10. Anicetus (A.D. 154–165). | 42. Boniface I. (A.D. 418–422). |
| 11. Soter (A.D. 165–173). | 43. Celestine (A.D. 422–432). |
| 12. Eleutherus (A.D. 173–188). | 44. Xystus III. (A.D. 432–440). |
| 13. Victor (A.D. 188–198). | 45. Leo I. (A.D. 440–461). |
| 14. <i>Zephyrinus</i> (A.D. 198–217). | 46. Hilary (A.D. 461–468). |
| 15. Callistus (A.D. 217–222). | 47. Simplicius (A.D. 468–483). |
| 16. <i>Urbanus</i> (A.D. 222–230). ¹ | 48. Felix III. (A.D. 483–492). |
| 17. <i>Pontianus</i> (A.D. 230–235). | 49. Gelasius (A.D. 492–496). |
| 18. <i>Anteros</i> (A.D. 235–236). | 50. Anastasius II. (A.D. 496–498). |
| 19. Fabian (A.D. 236–250). | 51. Symmachus (A.D. 498–514). |
| 20. Cornelius (A.D. 251–253). | 52. Hormisdas (A.D. 514–523). |
| 21. Lucius (A.D. 253–254). | 53. John I. (A.D. 523–526). |
| 22. Stephen (A.D. 254–257). | 54. <i>Felix IV.</i> (A.D. 526–530). |
| 23. Xystus II. (A.D. 257–258). | 55. Boniface II. (A.D. 530–532). |
| 24. Dionysius (A.D. 259–268). | 56. John II. (A.D. 532–535). |
| 25. <i>Felix I.</i> (A.D. 269–274). | 57. Agapetus (A.D. 535–536). |
| 26. <i>Eutychianus</i> (A.D. 275–283). | 58. <i>Silverius</i> (A.D. 536–538). |
| 27. <i>Gaius</i> (A.D. 283–296). | 59. Vigilius (A.D. 537–555). |
| 28. <i>Marcellinus</i> (A.D. 296–304). | 60. Pelagius I. (A.D. 555–560). |
| 29. <i>Marcellus</i> (A.D. ?). | 61. <i>John III.</i> (A.D. 560–573). |
| 30. <i>Eusebius</i> (April, 310–August,
310). | 62. <i>Benedict I.</i> (A.D. 574–578). |
| 31. Miltiades (311–314). | 63. Pelagius II. (A.D. 578–590). |
| 32. Silvester (314–335). | 64. Gregory I. (A.D. 590–604). |

Here follow the names and dates of the Roman bishops mentioned in this volume, who flourished after the time of S. Gregory the Great.

¹ The dates of the deaths of the first sixteen Bishops of Rome, and more especially of the first eight bishops, are to be regarded as approximations rather than as guaranteed by scientific chronology.

Boniface IV. (A.D. 608-615).	Boniface VIII. (A.D. 1294-1303).
Honorius (A.D. 625-638).	Urban V. (A.D. 1362-1370).
Leo II. (A.D. 682-683).	Adrian VI. (A.D. 1522-1523).
Zacharias (A.D. 741-752).	Benedict XIV. (A.D. 1740-1758).
Adrian I. (A.D. 771-795).	Clement XIV. (A.D. 1769-1774).
Leo IV. (A.D. 847-855).	Pius VII. (A.D. 1800-1823).
Nicholas I. (A.D. 858-867).	Pius IX. (A.D. 1846-1878).
Gregory VII. (A.D. 1073-1085).	Leo XIII. (A.D. 1878-).
Innocent III. (A.D. 1198-1216).	

INDEX

- ABERCIVS MARCELLUS**, 32
Acacius of Beroea (Aleppo), 331, 365, 371, 372
Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, 130, 230, 231, 243, 248, 250-252, 291, 497; was the principal consecrator of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, 237, 244; summary account of, 245-247
Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 359, 385, 386, 396, 398-403, 409-414, 416-418, 420, 423; his excommunication by Pope Felix III. and what came of it, 376-385; the beginning of the quarrel, 377-379; complete breach of communion between East and West resulted from excommunication of, 383; his death, 384
Acacius, appointed by his namesake of Caesarea to the see of Tarsus, 246
Acclamations, The day of the great, 359
Acholius, S., of Thessalonica, 334, 335, 483, 522, 540; made papal vicar in Eastern Illyricum by Damascus, 157
Acoemetae, The, 390
Adalbert, S., of Como, 405
Addis and Arnold, 443; their translation of the Irenaeus passage, 29; their view of its importance, 35; confuse S. Peter's call to be a disciple with his call to be an apostle, 90
Adeodatus, an African Bishop of the Proconsular province, 210
Adrian I., Pope, 174
Adrian VI., Pope, 398, 399
Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, 357
Aetius, the Champion of the Anomoeans, 246, 276
Aetius, the Patrician, 200
Agapetus, Pope, 417
Agapius, 176
Agileius, a deacon of Carthage, 205
Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, 453
Agrippinus, S., of Como, 405
Ahijah, symbolism of his rent garment, 470
Alaric, the Visigoth, 506
Alatheus, an Ostrogothic chief, 331, 515
Alemannus, 390
Alexander, an African bishop, present at the Council of Sirmium (in 358), 275
Alexander, S., Bishop of Alexandria, 170, 479
Alexander, Bishop of Antioch, 180, 372
Alexander I., S., Pope, 37
Alexander, Natalis. See Natalis Alexander
Alexandria, Church of, centralizing tendency in, 8; extent of province depending on, 8; obedience paid by Synesius to see of, 8; why considered an apostolic see, 10; S. Mark its first bishop, 10; influence of its see compared with that of Antioch, 11, 12; the second city of the empire, 12, 435; "the arbiter of doctrine" in the time of Julian, 265; letter to, from Council of Nicaea, 204, 478, 498
Alexandria, Councils of: (A.D. 320 or 321), 255; (A.D. 324), 170; (A.D. 362), 31, 159, 232, 274, 289-291, 320, 453, 454, 495, 498; its proceedings and the reception of its decrees, 259-272
Allies, Mr., 98, 126, 222
Allnatt, Mr., 123, 124, 421
Alypius, S., of Tagaste, 183, 185, 187, 194, 206, 208, 211, 491
Ambrose, S., Bishop of Milan, 94, 132, 134, 148, 265, 310, 313, 320, 330, 343-350, 364, 380, 434, 482-484, 504, 508, 509, 511, 512, 515, 518, 522, 530, 532-541; calls S. Peter "the Church's rock" in the hymn for Lauds on Sunday, 103; named before Pope Siricius by Council of Turin, 58, 113; seems to have inherited his metropolitical jurisdiction from his predecessor, 148; Arians as well as Catholics concurred in his election, 253

- Ambrosiaster, 93, 442; identified by Dom Morin with Isaac the Jew, 520
- Amelli, Dom Ambrogio, O.S.B., 212, 484
- Ammianus Marcellinus, 136; on the wealth and luxury of the popes, 133, 135; De Valois' appreciation of, 477
- Ampelius, Prefect of Rome, 303, 517
- Amphilochius, S., of Iconium, 165, 179, 335
- Analecta Bollandiana*, 391
- Anastasius I., Emperor, 360, 386, 387, 390, 392, 396-399, 410, 411, 414, 415, 419, 420
- Anastasius II., Emperor, 391
- Anastasius I., S., Pope, 157, 482
- Anastasius II., Pope, 212, 359, 377
- Anastasius Sinaita, 441
- Anatolius of Euboea, 261, 262
- Ancyra, Council of (April, 358), 276, 277, 280, 282
- Andrewes, Bishop, 476; on S. Peter's primacy, 475
- Anemius, Bishop of Sirmium, 483
- Anencletus (*al. Cletus*), S., Pope, 37, 38, 45, 445; a monarchical bishop, 5
- Angels of the seven churches, 442-443
- Anianus, appointed Bishop of Antioch, but never sat, 227
- Anicetus, S., Pope, 15, 37, 38
- Anthony, Bishop of Fussala, 194, 195, 208
- Antidius, Vicar of Rome, 517
- Antioch, Church of, a "truly apostolical" church, 10, 12, 365; its influence compared with that of the Church of Alexandria, 11, 12; the third city of the empire, 12, 435; its world-wide influence, 31; in fourth century regarded S. Peter as its founder, 124, 366, 367; its contest with the see of Jerusalem, 130; its relation to the Church of Rome during a large part of the fourth century, 227-372; it remained out of communion with Rome from A.D. 343 to A.D. 398, 232; in the year 361 separated Arians from its communion, 256; the dealings of the Council of Alexandria in 362 with, 261-265
- Antioch, Councils of: (A.D. 268), 68, 276, 280-282; decrees of, first quoted in Arian controversy at Council of Ancyra (in 358), 277; (A.D. 339), 229; (A.D. 340), 229; (A.D. 341), 144, 190, 229, 275, 280, 334, 440, 523; (A.D. 344), 232, 234; (A.D. 361), 250, 251; (A.D. 363), 291-293, 496-498; (A.D. 379), 160, 329-332, 348, 353
- Antonianus, Bishop, 5
- Antonius, an African bishop of the Proconsular province, 206-208
- Antonius, Bishop of Carpis, 208
- Anysius, Bishop of Thessalonica, 157, 158
- ἀξιόω*, meaning of the word in Poly-crates' letter to Victor, 15, 16
- Apiarius, a priest, first of Sicca, then of Tabraca: the episodes connected with his appeals to Rome, 183-194; other references to him, 197, 205, 211, 490
- Apollinarius, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria: became a heresiarch, 160; other references to him, 260, 305, 307, 308, 314-316, 324-326, 330, 498
- Apostolic sees: their influence, 10, 435; causes of their influence, 10; list of the, 10; teaching of apostles may be learnt from public teaching of, 20; continually consulted, 32, 178; traced back their succession to their first bishop, himself appointed by apostles, 40
- Aquileia, Church of: was probably metropolitanical during a great part of the second half of the fourth century, 149, 481-485; remained out of communion with Rome for nearly 150 years, 405
- Aquileia, Council of (September, 381), 331, 340, 343, 344, 346-350, 482, 483, 488, 511, 514-521, 531, 532, 534-538, 540, 541
- Aquilinus, Vicar of Rome (A.D. 382), 144, 486, 487, 510, 511, 513, 518, 519, 528, 542
- Arcadius, Emperor, 371, 379, 512
- Archidamus, one of S. Julius' legates at the Council of Sardica, 171
- Aretas, S., 389, 394-396
- Ariadne, Empress, 410
- Ariminum, Council of (A.D. 359), no papal legate at, 271; abrogation of decrees of, 273, 274; other references to, 162, 239, 247, 260, 291, 299, 300, 351
- Arius, the heresiarch, 170, 231, 233, 234, 254, 255, 291, 307, 330, 426, 428, 478
- Arles, Councils of: (A.D. 314), 138, 190, 460, 478, 480; (A.D. 353), 271
- Asclepas, Bishop of Gaza, 141
- Asellus, papal legate at Carthage (A.D. 419), 168, 184, 185
- Asterius, S., of Petra, 176, 259, 261, 264, 268, 270
- Asterius, the sophist, 480
- Athanasius, an African bishop, present in 358 at Council of Sirmium, 275
- Athanasius, S., of Alexandria: on the baptism of heretics, 62, 453, 454;

- contra mandum*, 162, 274; wrote a treatise against the errors of Marcellus of Ancyra, 236; proclaimed in 359 the essential agreement of the middle party with himself, 236; presided in 362 over Council of Alexandria, 259; never refers to Liberius as being the author of the legislation of that council, 267; from A.D. 357 to the winter of 362-363 was out of communion with Liberius, 270-272; his rehabilitation of Liberius, 272; was the chief restorer of the Church after the death of Constantius, 274; death of, 306; other references to, 31, 132, 135, 141, 143, 148, 159, 169, 171, 176, 179, 229, 230, 232-235, 237-240, 247, 252, 254, 255, 259-265, 268, 269, 273, 276, 277, 280-284, 286, 288-293, 296-300, 310, 320, 351, 378, 386, 427, 428, 437, 484, 495-499, 533, 543
- Athanasius of Ancyra, 246-248, 250, 291, 498
- Athanasius, Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 490-497), 385
- Atticus, S., Bishop of Constantinople, 188, 213, 367
- Atticus, Nonius Maximus, Prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 526, 527
- Aubé, M., 12, 450, 454, 456, 458, 459, 463
- Augustine, S., of Hippo: on S. Cyprian's gentleness and humility, 65, 66; on the power of the keys being given not to "one man," but to "the unity of the Church," 86, 471; his anti-Donatist ballad, 100, 101; taught that S. Peter was the symbol of the Church Militant, 101-103, 470, 471; taught that S. John was the symbol of the Church Triumphant, 101; changed his view about the meaning of "the rock," 101-104; on *Petrus* and *Petra*, 102, 103; did not hold the Vaticanist teaching about the papal powers, 104; his interpretation of the *Pasee oves*, 118, 119, 122, 123; in A.D. 397 knew nothing of the Council of Sardica, 156, 185; other references to, 51, 52, 54, 64, 70, 75-77, 88, 132, 152, 153, 183, 184, 187, 188, 193-195, 203, 206-211, 223, 265, 385, 386, 442, 454, 456, 458, 460, 461, 472, 491, 492
- Aurelius, S., Bishop of Carthage, 54, 143, 144, 183, 185, 187, 189, 190, 192, 194, 204-207, 209-211, 213, 376, 492
- Ausonius, the poet, 524, 525, 528
- Auxentius, Arian Bishop of Milan, the predecessor of S. Ambrose: was probably the first Metropolitan of Milan, 148, 434; other references to, 253, 299, 303, 484, 543
- Auxiliaris, Prefect of Rome, 201
- Bacchini, O.S.B., 148, 434, 435
- Bacchus, Father, 34
- Badagius, 176
- Ballerini, The brothers, 138, 173, 179, 189, 190, 205, 213, 317, 334, 359, 361, 415, 429, 450, 482, 491, 493
- Ballerini, Pietro, 263, 372
- Baluze, Étienne, 69, 87, 88, 200, 464
- Baptism of heretics: African view of, 62; Roman view of, 62; the question not decided by the Council of Nicaea, 62; view of post-Nicene Eastern Fathers concerning, 62, 63, 461; view of the Eustathians about, 264; Syrian and Palestinian practice in regard to, 453, 461; S. Athanasius' views concerning, 453, 454
- Barmby, Mr., 136
- Barnabas, S., 10
- Baronius, Cardinal, 65, 68, 75, 135, 158, 166, 184, 199, 200, 265, 271, 301, 320, 327, 335, 363, 386, 390, 392, 418, 419, 437, 438, 452, 457, 458, 462, 492, 525
- Barrow, Dr. Isaac, on S. Peter's primacy, 476
- Barry, Bishop, 107
- Barses, S., of Edessa, 301
- Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, 230, 237, 240, 242, 246, 275-281, 285
- Basil, S., of Caesarea in Cappadocia: quotes S. Firmilian as an authority, 68; his opinion of Pope Damasus, 136, 163, 164; supports S. Meletius, 160, 163; his character and position, 163; holds that, in the case of Marcellus of Ancyra, Roman Church "supported heresy," 164; his conception of the position of the Roman bishop illustrated, 164, 165; summary account of his career before he became bishop, 238-240; was ordained reader and consecrated bishop when he was out of communion with Rome, 238, 239; his negotiations from 371 to 377 to restore intercommunion between Rome and Antioch, 297-328; comes into communion with Rome, 301; his death, 328; other references to, 31, 70, 71, 94, 132, 179, 235, 237, 241, 242, 246-249, 252, 253, 256, 261, 267, 268, 271, 281, 282, 288-290, 292, 294-297, 340, 351, 352, 354, 363, 378, 383, 386, 396, 406, 460, 480, 497-499
- Basil, S., the elder, father of S. Basil the Great, 238

- Basilides, Bishop of Leon: deposed as a libellatic, 59; wrongly admitted to communion by Pope Stephen, 59; other references to, 436, 450-452
- Batifoll, Mgr., 43, 49, 231, 254, 363, 502
- Bausset, Cardinal de, 194
- Bede, S., the venerable, 223, 442
- Bellarmino, Cardinal, 98, 99, 123, 202, 430
- Benedict, S., of Como, 405
- Benedict XIV., Pope, 430
- Bennettis, Hieremias a, 424, 435
- Benson, Archbishop: on S. Cyprian's teaching about the episcopate, 6; other references to, 66, 67, 87, 91, 446, 451, 453, 458, 459, 461-463, 469, 537
- Bernard, S., 465
- Besançon, Council of (A.D. 444), 197
- Beveridge, Bishop of S. Asaph, 144
- Biener, 173
- Bilsborrow, Bishop, 432, 433
- Bingham, Joseph, 249, 461
- Bishops: normally chosen from clergy of local church in early times, 5; all essentially equal, 6; receive at consecration the *charisma veritatis certum*, 23; "the Church is settled upon the," 90; inherit the whole ordinary jurisdiction of the apostolic college, 6, 90; are styled "Vicars of Christ," 93, 407; are successors of S. Peter, 90, 94, 121, 123, 124; Gratian's rules for the trial of Western, 145-148; in some provinces the senior, acted as quasi-metropolitan, 149, 150; receive ecumenical jurisdiction at consecration, 436
- Blondel, 510
- Blunt, Professor, 220
- Boniface, Bishop of Carthage, 205
- Boniface, the Notary, 415, 416
- Boniface I., S., Pope, 182, 185-187, 189, 194, 195, 204, 206, 209, 213, 376, 502, 503, 513
- Boniface II., Pope, 157
- Boniface IV., Pope, 405
- Boniface VIII., Pope, 1, 2
- Bonner, Bishop, 25
- Bossue, Father, S.J., 67, 437, 453, 457, 458
- Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux: his criticism of Bishop Bull's treatment of Petavius, 429; other references to, 67, 83, 94, 138, 164, 194, 374-376, 430, 437, 464, 465
- Bottalla, Father, S.J.: his misunderstanding of various Cyprianic passages, 77-91; his criticism of S. Jerome, 161, 249, 250; his extraordinary explanation of an African canon against appeals to Rome, 189; his statement about appeals from Africa to Rome, 192; his strange account of the pacification of the Church in the time of Hormisdas, 402; other references to, 88, 107, 194, 222, 254, 403
- Bousset, Professor, 443
- Bouvier, Mgr., Bishop of Le Mans, 386
- Bouvy, M., 391
- Bramhall, Archbishop: on S. Peter's primacy, 475; other references to, 476, 477
- Bright, Dr., xxxii., 8, 12, 13, 41, 63, 130, 143, 180, 190, 236, 281, 338, 382, 383, 440, 446, 480, 481, 543
- Brightman, Mr., xxx., 27, 110
- Britonius, Bishop of Trier, 364, 483
- Brogie, The Duc de, 340, 362, 363
- Browne, Bishop Harold, on S. Peter's primacy, 476
- Bubalius, a Macedonian bishop, 183
- Buck, Father Victor de, S.J., 494
- Bull, Bishop: on S. Peter's primacy, 475, 476; other references to, 429, 430
- Bunsen, Baron, 443
- Butler, Alban, 386, 393, 394
- Butler, Bishop, 426
- Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 158
- Cabassutius, 435
- Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage: wrongly credited with a certain Latin version of the Nicene canons, 30, 139, 185, 434; deposed by a synod of 70 Numidian bishops, 152, 153
- Caesarea in Palestine, Church of: enjoyed metropolitan authority, 130; according to Clementine romance, one of S. Peter's chairs, 443
- Caesarea in Palestine, Council of (*circa* 195), 7, 16
- Caesarius, S., of Arles, 179
- Caesarius, a *Magister officiorum*, 337
- Caius, 47
- Cajetan, Cardinal, 4
- Caldonius, an African bishop, 81, 82
- Callistus, Pope, 65
- Campenses*, why the Antiochene Catholics were so styled, 256, 312, 314
- Cange, Du. *See* Du Cange
- Canon, Roman, of the Mass, 45
- Cantarelli, 517
- Canterbury, Archbishop of: his jurisdiction confined to his province, 9; his influence extends throughout Anglican communion, 9; normally the centre of communication and of communion to all the Anglican churches, 540; another reference to, 31

- Canus, Melchior, O.P., 430
 Capreolus, of Carthage, 427
 Capua, Council of (winter of 391-392), 367, 368, 508, 509
Caput, meaning of, in certain Cyprianic passages, 466-467
 Carpentier, Père, S. J., 395
 Carthage, Collation of. *See* Collation
 Carthage, Councils of: (*circa* 215), 453; (A.D. 251), first Cyprianic, 51, 81, 455; (A.D. 254 or 255), fourth Cyprianic, 59; (spring of 256), sixth Cyprianic, 63, 76, 457; (September, 256), seventh Cyprianic, 64-67, 76, 77, 454-458, 464, 471; (soon after 343), 185; (A.D. 390), 207; (June, 397), second under S. Aurelius, 523; (August, 397), third under S. Aurelius, 207, 522, 523; (June, 401), fifth under S. Aurelius, 523; (September, 401), sixth under S. Aurelius, 209, 523; (A.D. 404), ninth under S. Aurelius, 209; (A.D. 407), eleventh under S. Aurelius, 209; (June, 408), twelfth under S. Aurelius, 523; (October, 408), thirteenth under S. Aurelius, 523; (A.D. 416), 206; (May, 418), sixteenth under S. Aurelius, 184, 189, 205, 491; (December, 418), 184; (May, 419), seventeenth under S. Aurelius, 143, 154, 167, 168, 185, 204-210, 213, 491; (A.D. 421), eighteenth under S. Aurelius, 205; (*circa* 423), nineteenth under S. Aurelius, 205; (A.D. 426), twentieth under S. Aurelius, 54, 143, 190-194, 204-214, 493; (A.D. 525), 205; (A.D. 535), 206; (A.D. 550), 404
 Carthage, *See* of: its great influence, 11; the metropolitanical see of Proconsular Africa, 148, 150; it had no exaggerated authority, 183
 Cassian, 152
 Cassiodorus, 174, 442, 484
 Castus, of Sicca, 456
 Ceillier, Dom, O.S.B., 326
 Celestine, S., Pope: the letter of the African Church to, 190-193, 204-214; other references to, 54, 171, 172, 179, 189, 190, 194, 195, 197, 204-206, 209-213, 376, 493
 Celticius, or Celticus, African bishop, probably of the Proconsular province, 207, 210
 Ceriani, Mgr., 500
 Chalcedon, Council of (A.D. 451), fourth Ecumenical; its twenty-eighth canon historically correct, 12, 13; that canon rejected by the West, 12, 13; but it practically held its ground, 13; absurd perversion of the meaning of the ninth canon of, 175; other references to, 36, 129, 130, 144, 155, 166-169, 325, 350, 351, 357-361, 376-378, 382, 385-387, 390, 393-395, 397, 399, 403, 411, 412, 416, 419, 428, 431
 Chapman, Dom, O.S.B., 29, 30, 33, 34, 441, 442
 Charles the Great, Emperor, 174
 Chelidonius, Bishop of Besançon, 196-199
 Chiniac de la Bastide Duclaux, 87
Christian Remembrancer, 55
 Chromatius, S., of Aquileia, 481-483
 Chrysostom, S.: his dealings with the "tall brothers," 60, 61; his view that at the Council of Jerusalem S. James, as being in high authority, appeared in the milder part, and left what was unpleasant for S. Peter to say, 115; the Oxford translation of his Homilies on the Acts, based on the best manuscripts, 115; his interpretation of the *Pasce oves*, 123-127; was out of communion with Rome until he was fifty-one or fifty-four years old, 124, 127, 366; regarded the Eustathians as schismatics, 368-370; his treatment of S. Peter's share in S. Matthias' election, 372-375; the date of his preaching his Homilies on the Ephesians, 506; other references to, 88, 94, 132, 158, 161, 166, 202, 223, 228, 253, 254, 256, 329, 351, 352, 354, 364, 395, 371, 372, 379, 396, 406, 481, 502, 504, 505, 507, 508
Church Quarterly Review, 12, 440
Circuits of Peter, 41
 Claudia, 445
 Claudius, Emperor, 436
 Clement, S., of Alexandria, 46, 112, 113, 465, 474
 Clement, S., of Rome, Pope: is counted as first Bishop of Rome by Tertullian, 39, 40, 45; made no claim in his epistle to any papal jurisdiction over the Corinthian Church, 96, 472; his name misplaced in some early papal lists, 444, 445; other references to, 16, 21-23, 37, 181, 433, 443, 444
 Clement, S., spurious epistle of, to S. James, prefixed to Clementine Homilies, 42-44, 47, 48, 445
 Clementine romance, probably originated theory of S. Peter's Roman episcopate, 41-49; its depreciation of S. Paul, 42, 43; its author an Ebionite, 41-43; its Ebionite tendency not recognized in the West, 48; its date, 48, 49; represents S. James as a hyper-apostolic pope, 113, 443; is entirely un-Roman, 444; its influence at Rome, 444; brought about

- misplacement of S. Clement's name, 444, 445
- Cletus, S., Pope. *See* Anencletus
- Coelestius, the co-adjutor of Pelagius, 184, 491
- Coleti, Edition of the *Concilia* by, 48 *et passim*
- Collation of Carthage (A.D. 411), a conference between Catholics and Donatists, 207-210
- Collectio Avellana*: its contents, 415; other references to, 145, 206, 283, 360, 381, 384, 399-402, 410-412, 415-418, 420-423, 510, 511, 513, 517
- Collectio Hispana*: its contents, 415; other references to, 415-417
- Collectio Lacensis*, 3, 4, 28, 34, 57, 63, 117, 218, 433
- Collections of canons and other ecclesiastical documents, summary account of various, 499, 500
- Colluthus, a pseudo-bishop in Egypt, 170
- Colombier, Père, S. J., 445
- Columbanus, S., writes to the pope to tell him that his juniors rightly refuse to communicate with him, 405
- Como, The ten saintly bishops of, who were never in communion with Rome, 405
- Compiègne, Council of (A.D. 833), 93
- Constans, Emperor, 170, 231, 233
- Constantine I, Emperor: in all probability appointed Hosius to preside at Nicaea, 138, 169, 170; other references to, 131, 137, 152, 158, 438, 478, 479, 486
- Constantine IV. (Pogonatus), Emperor, 398, 478
- Constantinople, Church of: the growth of its authority, 130
- Constantinople, Councils of: (A.D. 360), 238, 241-244, 246, 250, 279, 296; (A.D. 381), second Ecumenical, 13, 36, 130, 144, 155, 165, 171, 339, 346, 349, 350, 353-363, 371, 440, 454, 489, 501-503, 505, 506, 509, 512, 532, 535-538, 541; (summer, 382), 10, 155, 237, 353, 364, 379, 483, 504-506, 522, 542; (A.D. 394), 176, 354; (A.D. 448), 355, 484; (A.D. 518), 359; (A.D. 536), 397, 423; (A.D. 553), fifth Ecumenical, 251, 404; (A.D. 680), sixth Ecumenical, 478
- Constantius, Bishop of Uzès, 201
- Constantius, Emperor, 135, 159, 231-234, 240, 242, 249, 254, 256, 258, 259, 268-272, 274, 276-278, 281, 283, 286, 351, 434, 481, 484
- Constantius, the Patrician, 152, 513
- Convenire ad*, meaning of, in Irenaean passage, 25-27; meaning of "*conventio ad*" in 2 Cor. vi. 15 (Vulgate), 439
- Corbellini, 494
- Cornelius, S., Pope: is called "brother" by S. Cyprian, 5; parts of one of S. Cyprian's letters to, explained, 50-55; passages about, in S. Cyprian's letters, explained, 78-85; other references to, 92, 446, 448-450, 455, 459, 461, 464, 467
- Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, 526, 527
- Corpus juris canonici*, 2
- Constant, Dom, O.S.B., 183, 189, 193, 206, 225, 333, 361, 404, 437, 491
- Cracow, University of, 88
- Crescens, an African bishop, present in 358 at Council of Sirmium, 275
- Crescens, of Cirta, 76
- Cresconius, 76
- Cuntz, 171
- Cyprian, S., of Carthage: treats popes as his equals, 5, 50; his teaching about the joint-tenancy of bishops, 6; his witness against the papal theory, 49-72; is styled by the clergy of Rome, "Most blessed and most glorious pope," 50; denounces appeals to Rome, 53, 54, 154, 446-450; his principles of Church-government accepted at Rome in his time, 54; urges Stephen to help Church in Gaul, 56-58, 451; supports Felix and Sabinus against Pope Stephen, 59-61, 452; writes to Pompeius against Stephen's letter, 64; denounces any one who claims to be "a bishop of bishops," 65; is excommunicated by Pope Stephen, 67, 72-77, 225; special honour paid to him by the Roman Church, 71; the collecting of his letters, a work of time, 76; passages of his works cited by Romanists in favour of the papalist theory, shown to have been misunderstood, 77-95, 464-471; ante-dates the commencement of S. Peter's apostolate, 88, 90, 92; his writings proscribed by Pope Gelasius, 89; sees in our Lord's promise to S. Peter the institution of the episcopate, 89, 90, 92, 104, 470; teaches that the Church was founded on S. Peter by the word of the Lord, 93, 94; the meaning of his words, "*ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*," 51, 52, 445, 446; never retracted his views on heretical baptism, 460; his view of the sense in which S. Peter was the "*origo unitatis*," 469; taught that S. Peter symbolized the Church's

- unity, 88, 470; other references to, 37, 39, 101, 114, 121, 122, 179, 183, 192, 193, 396, 433, 436, 454-459, 461, 463, 492, 537
- Cyriacus, Dr., 440
- Cyriacus, S., the Anchorite, 388, 392
- Cyril, S., of Alexandria: on the *Pasce oves*, 118-120, 127, 128; presided at Ephesus, not as papal legate, but in virtue of the dignity of his see, 376, 377; other references to, 126, 171, 172, 179, 188, 213, 356, 357, 367, 390, 427, 428
- Cyril, S., of Jerusalem: summary account of the first ten years of his episcopate, 237, 238; other references to, 126, 130, 165, 230, 232, 244, 245, 259, 351, 355, 356, 461
- Cyril, of Scythopolis, 386, 387, 392-394
- Dalgairns, Father, 432
- Damasus, Pope: the riots at his election, 133, 136; is described by S. Basil as being a haughty inconsiderate person who expected to be flattered, 136; his pontificate, 144-166; received coercive patriarchal jurisdiction over bishops of Western empire by decrees of Valentinian I. and of Gratian, 144-157; made S. Acholius of Thessalonica his vicar in Eastern Illyricum, 157; ignored S. Meletius and in 375 recognized Paulinus as the true and only Bishop of Antioch, 160, 316; S. Jerome's famous letter to, 162; regarded by S. Basil as an "arrogant" man, 163, 164; elected by the adherents of Pope Felix II., 286; his letter *Per filium meum*, addressed to Paulinus, 317, 318; according to Baronius, "was deceived by certain false reports," 327; other references to, 10, 99, 104, 137, 139, 155, 156, 158, 165, 166, 178-181, 198, 204, 270, 286, 294, 297-300, 302-316, 318-324, 326, 327, 329, 331-335, 337, 338, 342, 343, 345, 348-350, 364, 383, 386, 406, 483-485, 487, 489, 493, 499, 500, 503, 504, 510, 517, 518, 520-523, 530, 538-541, 543
- Daniel, S., the Stylite, 166, 388, 391, 396
- Darbois, Archbishop of Paris, 111
- Dated Creed, 427
- Decentius, of Engubium, 180
- Delarochelle, J., 470, 471
- Demophilus, Arian Bishop of Beroea in Thrace, afterwards Arian Bishop of Constantinople, 233, 336
- Denifle, Father, O.P., 2
- Denys (or Dionysius), S., of Alexandria: mentions the excommunication of the Asians by Pope Stephen, 67; his letters on the baptismal controversy, 70; other references to, 68, 73-76, 79, 179, 461-463
- Development of doctrine: Vatican teaching on papal authority not set forth as a late, 4; other references to, xv., xxviii., xxix., 405, 406, 424-433
- Dhu'n Navvâs, King of the Homeritæ, 395
- Dianius, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 238, 239
- Diodorus, a layman of Antioch, afterwards Bishop of Tarsus, 248, 256, 335, 365
- Diodorus, of Tyre, 498
- Dion Chrysostom, 12
- Dionysius, S., Bishop of Alexandria. *See* Denys
- Dionysius, S., Bishop of Corinth, 472
- Dionysius Exiguus, 172-175, 207, 212, 213, 440, 491
- Dionysius, S., Bishop of Milan, 148
- Dionysius, S., Pope, 67, 70, 71, 254, 255, 459
- Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, 166-169, 354-356, 383, 384, 387, 399, 411, 416, 419, 428
- Dioscorus, a Roman deacon and legate, afterwards an antipope, 360
- Diospolis, Council of (A.D. 415), 130
- Döllinger, Dr. von, 251, 440, 453
- Domnus II., Bishop of Antioch, 235, 354
- Donatus, an African bishop, probably of the Proconsular province, 207, 210
- Denatus, Bishop of Carthage, the immediate predecessor of S. Cyprian, 461
- Donatus, a Carthaginian priest who joined the party of Felicissimus, 447
- Dorotheus, one of the clergy of S. Meletius, 163, 298-300, 304-309, 315, 320, 324, 326, 327
- Dublin Review*, 33, 34, 216, 319, 409, 417, 424
- Du Cange, 51, 193, 390, 439
- Duchesne, Mgr.: his account of Bishop Proculus, 152; his estimate of Pope Zosimus, 187; his assertion of the right and duty of every bishop to interfere with other bishops in defence of Church discipline, 197; his opinion that Sozomen's account of Liberius' fall is based on trustworthy documents, 276; on the "years of Peter," 444; other references to, 7, 8, 13, 16, 21, 48, 55, 58, 68, 70, 139, 145, 148, 149, 156-158, 176, 196, 228, 263, 265, 271, 274, 281, 283, 285-287, 291, 340, 343, 351, 356, 361,

- 414, 434-438, 445, 446, 448, 450, 452, 453, 458, 460, 461, 464, 482, 483, 493, 510, 519, 520, 528, 540
- Dupin, on Pope Stephen's action in regard to Bishop Basilides, 59
- Eastern Church: middle party in, during large part of fourth century, 235-241; regarded at Rome as under anathema during thirty-five years, 409-414
- Ecclesia principalis*, meaning of, 51, 52, 446
- Elesbaan, S., the King, 389, 394-396
- Eleusius, of Cyzicus, 275-277, 281
- Eleusius, a Donatist, 152, 185
- Eleutherus, S., Pope, 15, 21, 37
- Elias, Bishop of Aquileia, 172
- Elias, S., of Jerusalem, 166, 386-388, 396, 404, 418
- Elpidius, a priest, 307
- Elvira, Council of (A.D. 300), 190
- Elwin, Mr., 63, 461
- Emmelia, S., the mother of S. Basil, 238
- Ephesus, Church of: S. Irenæus appeals to its witness, 22, 35; enjoyed longer than other churches the privilege of being taught by a resident apostle, 22; other references to, 10, 40
- Ephesus, Councils of: (*circa* 195), 16; (A.D. 430), third Ecumenical, 130, 171, 180, 182, 350, 355-361, 376, 377, 427, 478, 479; (A.D. 449), *latrocinium*, 166-168, 354, 356, 357, 512
- Epiphanius, S., Patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 520-535), 389, 391, 401, 402, 421-423
- Epiphanius, S., Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, 37, 45, 47, 176, 198, 237, 242, 243, 246, 248, 252, 254, 255, 277, 290, 324, 437, 441, 442, 478, 479, 481, 522
- Epitomes, Clementine, 41
- Estius, 107, 112, 439
- Eudoxius, Bishop of Antioch and afterwards of Constantinople, 158, 227, 232, 233, 248-250, 255, 276, 283, 294, 296
- Eulalius, a supposed Bishop of Antioch, 227
- Eulalius, a supposed Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 243
- Eulogius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, 130
- Eulogius, S., of Edessa, 160, 165, 329
- Euphemius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 384, 385, 387, 390, 391, 397, 399, 400, 402, 409, 410, 412, 416
- Euphrates, Bishop of Cologne, 232
- Euphronius, Bishop of Antioch, 227, 229
- Eupsychius, S., 318
- Ἐὐσεβεία, meaning of the word, 338
- Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, the immediate predecessor of S. Basil, 298
- Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, 15 *et passim*
- Eusebius, of Dorylaeum, 355
- Eusebius, the eunuch, 283
- Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, 142, 158
- Eusebius, S., Bishop of Samosata: a summary account of what is known of him, 241; other references to, 160, 163, 164, 247-253, 291, 292, 300, 304, 312, 327, 329, 330, 351-353, 386, 495, 496
- Eusebius, S., Bishop of Vercellae: baselessness of the theory ascribing the status of a papal legate to, 267, 493-496; other references to, 159, 234, 259, 261, 263-265, 268, 270, 271, 273, 274, 288, 303, 304, 454, 508
- Eusignius, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 527
- Eustathians at Antioch: origin of their schism, 158, 159; blame of it to be laid on Lucifer and Paulinus, 159; analogy of position of Eustathians to position of English Romanists, 160; from 331 to 375 Eustathians were out of communion with Rome, 232; they were given to calumniating S. Meletius, 248, 363; the ground of their separation, 251, 264; regarded by S. Chrysostom as schismatics, 368-370; other reference to, 252
- Eustathius, S., of Antioch: deposed on false charges, 158; before going into banishment urged his people to remain in communion with the Church of Antioch, 158, 352, 364; other references to, 227, 228, 235, 352, 365
- Eustathius, of Sebaste, 237, 238, 240, 242-244, 250, 275-277, 281, 292, 295, 296, 324-326, 334, 352
- Euthymius, S., the Great, 336, 392
- Euthymius Zigabenus, 127
- Eutropius, a prefect of the praetorium, 336
- Eutyches, the heresiarch, 355-357, 378, 383, 384, 399, 411, 412, 416, 419, 428, 484
- Euty chius, S., Patriarch of Constantinople, 143, 174, 404, 405
- Euty chius, of Eleutheropolis, 291
- Euzoïus, Arian bishop at Antioch, 160, 255-257, 259
- Evagrius, Eustathian bishop at Antioch, successor of Paulinus: his early history, 303; his uncanonical consecration, 367; the date of his death, 506-509; other references to, 176,

- 265, 304, 305, 307, 310-312, 315, 320, 368-371, 406, 505, 518
- Evagrius Scholasticus, the Church historian, 378, 393
- Evangelus, of Assuras, 207
- Evangelus, a priest, 489
- Evaristus, S., Pope, 37
- Evethius, Bishop of Ephesus, 295
- Executores*, 193
- Fabian, S., Pope : called by S. Cyprian, "That good man, my colleague," 5 ; his martyrdom, 79, 459 ; other reference to, 78
- Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, 80
- Facundus, of Hermiane, 414
- Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, 55, 56
- Faustinus, Bishop of Potentia, papal legate in Africa, 143, 168, 184-186, 190, 191, 193, 207, 376, 492
- Felicianus Pastor, 212
- Felicissimus, a Carthaginian deacon, who became a leader of schismatic laxists, 94, 154, 446-448
- Felix, Bishop of Bisica Lucana, 456
- Felix, Bishop of Merida, successor to Martialis, 59, 60, 452
- Felix II., Pope : canonized by the Roman Church, 287 ; other references to, 28, 135, 271, 276, 279, 285-287, 434, 484
- Felix III., Pope : his formal excommunication of the East, 409 ; other references to, 183, 359, 376-379, 381-385, 409, 410, 414
- Felix, Bishop of Trier, 58
- Felix, Bishop of Uthina, 464
- Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, 28
- Ferrandus, a Carthaginian deacon, 205
- Festal Index*, 233
- Festus, Porcius, 43
- Fialon, M. Eugène, 299
- Firmilian, S., of Caesarea in Cappadocia : on rebaptizing heretics, 62 ; his letter published and in part translated by S. Cyprian, 67, 458 ; his sanctity, 68 ; his letter to S. Cyprian, extracts from, 68, 69 ; holds that all bishops inherit the promise to S. Peter, 104 ; was excommunicated by Pope Stephen, 72-77, 225 ; other references to, 17, 64, 437, 438, 454, 456, 460, 463, 471
- Flacillus, Bishop of Antioch, 227, 229
- Flavian I., S., Bishop of Antioch : the legend about his supposed perjury, 503-505 ; where and when he was consecrated bishop, 505-506 ; other references to, 166, 176, 227, 248, 256, 308, 320, 338, 341, 346, 348, 349, 354, 364-368, 370-372, 380, 502, 503, 507-509, 539
- Flavian II., S., Patriarch of Antioch, (A.D. 498-512), 388, 391, 396, 418
- Flavian I., S., of Como, 405
- Flavian II., S., of Como, 405
- Flavian, S., Bishop of Constantinople, 354-356, 377, 428
- Flavianus, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 525, 526
- Fleury, Cardinal de, 87
- Fleury, the historian, thinks that S. Leo excommunicated S. Hilary of Arles, 199
- Florentius, Bishop of Puteoli, 528
- Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, 476
- Fortia d'Urban, 337
- Fortunatian, Bishop of Aquileia, 434, 484
- Fortunatianus, Bishop of Assuras, 451
- Fortunatianus, Bishop of Neapolis, 207, 209, 210
- Fortunatianus, Bishop of Sicca, 208
- Fortunatus, an African bishop, probably of the Proconsular province, 207, 210
- Fortunatus, a schismatic bishop at Carthage, 50, 51, 154, 446-449
- Fortunatus, probably to be identified with the Bishop of Thuccaboris of that name, 81, 82, 471
- Franzelin, Cardinal : on apostolicity as a necessary mark of a doctrine of the faith, 430 ; other references to, 276, 281
- Fravitas, Patriarch of Constantinople, 384, 385
- Freppel, Mgr., 458
- Fritigern, a Visigothic chief, 331
- Funk, Dr., his translation of *convenire ad*, 25 ; other references to, 29, 265, 442, 451
- Gabinus, King of the Quadi, 515
- Gabriel, S., the Archimandrite, 388, 392
- Galla Placidia, Empress, 200
- Garnier, Père, S.J., 168
- Gaudentius, S., of Brescia, 48
- Gaudentius, of Naissus, 157
- Gaul : till about A.D. 400, no metropolitans in, 56, 149, 483 ; relation of Church of Rome to Church of Gaul, in third century, 451
- Gelasius, of Cyzicus, an untrustworthy historian, 138, 478
- Gelasius, Pope, 89, 183, 335, 359, 361, 377, 382-385, 396, 409, 410, 416, 499
- Gelzer, 171
- Generosus, a Christian gentleman of Cirta, 101
- Genethlius, Bishop of Carthage, 207
- Genitive of apposition, S. Cyprian's use of, 466

- Gennadius, S., Bishop of Constantinople, 179
 George, of Laodicea, 250, 252, 277
 German, S., of Auxerre, 196-198
 Germinius, of Sirmium, 275, 277, 279, 281, 285
Gesta Liberii, 271
 Gibbon, 134
 Glorius, a Donatist, 152, 193
 Godefroy (Gothofredus), 486, 487, 525
 Godet, M., 443
 Gonzalez, 417
 Gordius, a Carthaginian priest, who joined the party of Felicissimus, 447
 Gore, Mr., 52, 63, 88, 115, 118, 443, 489
 Gorgonius, a bishop, 264
 Goyau, M., 486
 Gratian, the canonist, 154, 493
 Gratian, Emperor: his rules for the trial of Western bishops, 145-148; other references to, 144, 149-151, 153-157, 178, 195, 306, 328, 329, 331, 337, 340, 342, 349, 350, 485-488, 510-526, 528, 532, 534, 538, 539, 541, 542
 Gratry, Père, 28, 382
 Gratus, S., Bishop of Carthage, 185
 Gregory, S., the elder, father of S. Gregory Nazianzen, 239, 301
 Gregory, Bishop of Elvira, 260
 Gregory, S., Nazianzen: his interpretation of the *Pasce oves*, 127; the date of his twenty-second oration, 501-502; other references to, 61, 165, 179, 239, 241, 253, 315, 321, 341, 342, 363, 386, 440, 503, 504, 529-531, 534-536, 538
 Gregory, S., Nyssen: a passage in his funeral oration on S. Meletius, discussed, 256-257; other references to, 68, 94, 136, 160, 165, 166, 179, 223, 238, 247, 329, 335, 363
 Gregory I., S., Pope, 52, 148, 350, 371
 Gregory VII., Pope, 48, 371
 Gregory, S., Thaumaturgus, 68, 179, 238
 Gregory, S., of Tours, 55
 Grotius, 443
Guardian, The, 41, 188
 Guettée, The Abbé, 440
 Guizot, M., 131
 Guldenpenning, 338
 Günther, Otto, 144, 415, 417, 510, 511, 514
 Gwatkin, Dr., 8, 157, 169, 231, 235-237, 245, 248, 253, 277, 280, 282, 283, 302, 334, 351, 454, 477, 481
 Haddan, Mr., 149
 Haenel, 486, 525
 Halloix, Père, S.J., 437
 Hammond, Mr. C. E., 99
 Hammond, Dr. Henry, 442
 Hardouin, Père, S.J., 532
 Harnack, 43, 48, 49, 236, 443
 Hartel, 464
 Headlam, Mr. A. C., 444
 Hefele, Bishop of Rottenburg, 58, 77, 130, 141, 142, 145, 154, 155, 162, 165, 168, 175, 189, 205, 229, 243, 250, 265, 266, 280, 281, 285-287, 306, 325, 326, 334, 351, 359, 382, 417, 453, 455, 458, 480, 481, 484, 491, 510, 519, 522, 528
 Hegesippus, 32, 45-47
 Helenus, Bishop of Tarsus, 75
 Heliodorus, a friend of S. Jerome, who became Bishop of Altinum, 162
 Helladius, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 335
 Hemmer, The Abbé, 265
Henoticon, The, 377, 378, 390
 Henry, a clerk, living (*circa* 1100) in the abbey of Pomposa, 511
 Hesperius, the son of Ausonius, 524, 525, 528
 Hesychius, the lexicographer, 125
 Hesychius, Bishop of Salona, 335
 Hesychius, S., the Theologian, 113, 114
 Hilarian fragment, the sixth, three letters in, their genuineness not above suspicion, 286, 287
 Hilary, S., Bishop of Arles: his controversy with S. Leo, 196-202; presided at the Council of Besançon, 197; begged S. Leo not to break the canons, 198; shocked S. Leo by his plainness of speech in asserting the independence of the Church in Gaul, 199; "would not suffer himself to be subject to the blessed Apostle Peter," 199; was put under arrest, 199; did not communicate with S. Leo while in Rome, 199; was perhaps excommunicated by S. Leo, 199; died in the odour of sanctity, 201; is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology, 202
 Hilary, the deacon, the leader of the more extreme Luciferians, 273
 Hilary, S., Bishop of Poitiers: describes the blasphemies of Eudoxius, 158; from 357 to 363 probably held no communion with Liberius, 272; on the true Vicar of Christ, 407; other references to, 229, 230, 236, 240, 253, 255, 258, 260, 261, 264, 270, 272-274, 276, 278, 281, 282, 284, 286, 292, 320, 334, 497
 Hilary, S., Pope: vehemently attacked S. Mamertus, 200; other reference to, 377
 Hildebrand. *See* Gregory VII.

- Hilgenfeld, 171
Himerius, Bishop of Tarraco, 181, 197, 273, 485
Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, 52
Hippolytus, S., 47, 65, 441, 445
Hispana. See *Collectio Hispana*
Hodgkin, Dr., 331, 506, 515
Hogan, Dr., 425
Holstenius, Lucas, librarian of the Vatican, 484
Homer, Iliad of, quoted by S. Basil, 163, 164
Homilies, Clementine, 41, 443, 444
Honoratus, S., of Lerins, 152
Honoratus, S., of Marseilles, the disciple and biographer of S. Hilary of Arles, 198, 199, 201
Honoratus, a Mauritanian bishop, 522
Honoratus, Bishop of Thucca, 456
Honoratus, S., of Vercellae, 265, 494
Honorius, Emperor, 209, 513
Honorius, Pope, 398, 399, 478
Horace, 466
Hormisdas, Pope : urges Emperor to use force to compel obedience to papal demands, 401 ; other references to, 93, 172, 183, 212, 359-361, 377, 388, 389, 391, 398, 400-404, 409, 411-424, 520
Hormisdas, a prefect of the praetorium, 355
Hort, Dr., 116, 237, 241, 248, 291, 292, 355, 356, 363, 442
Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, 137, 138, 142, 143, 166, 169-172, 230, 239, 276, 376, 479
Hugo de S. Caro, Cardinal, 442
Hurter, Father, S.J., 74
Hyginus, S., Pope : discussion whether he was eighth or ninth Roman bishop, 38, 39 ; other references to, 15, 37
Hylas, a freedman of the elder Melania and a friend of S. Jerome, 310
Hypatius, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 525, 526, 528
Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, 168, 405
Iconium, Council of (A.D. 230), 462
Ifland, 338
Ignatius, S., Bishop of Antioch, 429, 435
Ihm, Professor, of Halle, 510, 515
Illyricum, Eastern, praetorian prefecture of, administered from 362 to 379 by the Prefect of Italy, 150, 524 ; papal vicariate in, created, 157
Illyricum, Western, Council in (A.D. 375), 307
Importunus, Bishop of Besançon, 197
Innocent, a lay friend of S. Jerome, 310
Innocent I., S., Pope, 157, 158, 179, 180, 182, 183, 206-210, 265, 379, 481
Innocent III., Pope, 2, 371
Interpolations, in S. Cyprian's treatise *De Catholicae Ecclesiae unitate*, 87, 89, 122
Ireland, Church of, not Romanized till twelfth century, 155
Irenaeus, S., Bishop of Lyons : admonished Pope Victor, 15-18 ; the famous passage about the Roman Church in the treatise *Contra omnes haereticos* by, 19-35 ; probably consecrated at Rome, 20, 21 ; office for his feast in Roman breviary, 28 ; knew nothing about papal infallibility, 35 ; says nothing about devolution of primacy from S. Peter to Roman bishops, 37 ; did not believe that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome, 37 ; his numbering of the Roman bishops, 37-39 ; his description of the Church of Jerusalem, 52 ; other references to, 32, 45, 49, 51, 75, 429, 440-442
Irenion, S., Bishop of Gaza, 291, 292
Isaac, a converted Jew who relapsed into Judaism and is identified by Dom Morin with Ambrosiaster, 520, 521, 523, 538, 541
Ischyra, a pseudo-presbyter in Egypt, 170
Isidore, S., a priest of Alexandria, 371, 372
Israel, analogy between organization of, and organization of Church, 219-221 ; position of the high priest in, 221, 222
Ithacians, schism of, 58
James, S., the brother of the Lord : was first Bishop of Jerusalem, 41, 44 ; was ranked among the apostles, 112 ; in Jerusalem took precedence of S. Peter, 113 ; was called by Rufinus "the bishop of the apostles," 113 ; was called by S. Hesychius "the exarch of the apostles," 113 ; presided at the Council of Jerusalem, 113-116 ; is represented in Clementine romance as S. Peter's superior, 443
James I., King of England, on S. Peter's primacy, 475
Jansenists, The, 251
Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, 332
Januarius, Bishop of Caralis, 148
Januarius, Bishop of Gisipa, 207, 209
Javolcnus, Priscus, 6
Jebb, Professor, Sir Richard, 462
Jerome, S., describes the worldliness of the Roman clergy, 137 ; some details of his early history, 161 ; faults in, pointed out by Father

- Bottalla, 161, 249, 250; his famous letter to Damasus, 162; the early age at which he wrote that letter, 162, 163; that letter does not in its teaching represent the apostolic tradition, 165; was misled by Damasus into joining the Eustathians, 165; it was apparently at his petition that Damasus' letter *Per filium meum* was written, 316, 499, 500; on the true Vicar of Christ, 407; meaning of a passage in his treatise against Jovinian, 488-489; his faith became in time purified, 489; other references to, 16, 18, 45, 66, 100, 119, 131-135, 152, 166, 227, 239, 242, 248, 249, 258, 260, 261, 264, 269, 270, 273, 284, 286, 303, 304, 309-315, 335, 338, 340, 363, 368, 386, 439, 442, 481, 484, 523, 527
- Jerusalem, Church of: the variations of its influence, 11; its lack of civil importance, 11; S. James its first bishop, 41, 44; the mother-church of the whole world, 52; its bishopric regarded by some as a higher dignity than the apostolate, 112, 113; the growth of its authority, 130; it finally acquired patriarchal jurisdiction, 130, 155; "no one dares to separate himself from" it, 401; was not quartodeciman in the time of S. Firmilian, 438
- Jerusalem, Councils of: (*circa* A.D. 50), 113-116, 447; (A.D. 518), 359, 393
- John, S., the Apostle and Evangelist: constituted S. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, 10, 40, 45; kept Easter in the quartodeciman way, 14, 15; one of the founders of the Church of Ephesus, 22; did not teach papalism to S. Polycarp, 35; was never Bishop of Ephesus, 40; is regarded by S. Augustine as the symbol of the Church Triumphant, 86, 101; other reference to, 36
- John Angeloptes, Bishop of Ravenna, 148
- John I., Bishop of Antioch, 390, 428
- John, S., the Chuzibite, 388, 393
- John II., S., Bishop of Como, 405
- John III., S., Bishop of Como, 405
- John II., Patriarch of Constantinople, 359, 360, 388, 390, 397-401, 412, 417, 420, 421
- John, Bishop of Elche in Spain, 415, 417
- John II., Bishop of Jerusalem, 130
- John III., Patriarch of Jerusalem, 359
- John, Bishop of Nicopolis, 360
- John I., Pope, 395
- John II., Pope, 361
- John Scholasticus, a schismatic patriarch of Constantinople, 143, 173, 174
- John, S., the Silentiary, 389, 394, 396
- John, a monk of Syria Secunda, 419
- John Talaia. *See* Talaia
- Jordanes, the Gothic historian, 331, 515
- Josephus, on the civil precedence of Antioch, 12
- Jovian, Emperor, 235, 272, 273, 288, 291, 293, 294, 497, 498
- Jovinian, a heretic, 488, 489
- Jubaianus, a Mauritanian bishop, 66, 84, 85, 92, 115, 467, 469
- Julian the Apostate, Emperor, 258, 259, 267, 288, 493
- Julian, Bishop of Cos, 167, 168
- Julian, Cardinal, 212
- Julianus, a celebrated jurist, 173
- Julius, S., Pope, 135, 141-143, 171, 204, 229-231, 233, 234, 238, 434, 480, 481, 503
- Jungmann, Professor, of Louvain: on the fundamental importance of the theory of S. Peter's supposed Roman episcopate, 36; on the substantial orthodoxy of the majority of the Semi-Arians, 240; other references to, 46, 77, 454, 458
- Justel, Henri, 173, 176
- Justin, Emperor, 390, 394, 396, 397, 401, 403, 414, 420, 423
- Justin Martyr, S., 32
- Justinian, Emperor, 143, 174, 390, 401, 403, 317, 525
- Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, 130, 377
- Keys, The power of the, given not to "one man," but to "the unity of the Church," 86, 108, 471, 488
- Knabenbauer, Father, S.J., 222
- Koran, The, 395
- Kymatius, Bishop of Paltus, 261, 262, 264
- Labbe, 510, 531, 532
- Labyrinth*, The *Little*, 47
- Ladislav, King of Poland, 88
- Lagarde, 49
- Lampsacus, Council of (A.D. 364), 240, 294
- Langen, 510
- Lapide, Cornelius a, S.J., 107, 222
- Lapie, Colonel, 337
- Latrocinium*. *See* Ephesus, Councils of
- Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, his *Conference with Fisher*, 55
- Launoi, Jean de, doctor of the Sorbonne, 88, 377
- Lawrence, Cardinal, 212
- Lea, John Walter, on the Cyprianic view of the independence of bishops, 65

- Lejay, The Abbé, 28
 Leo I., Emperor, 358, 403
 Leo I., S., Pope: did not claim any inherent right to preside at an Ecumenical Council, 167-169; his controversy with S. Hilary of Arles, 196-202; obtained a rescript in favour of the authority of the Roman see from Valentinian III., 200, 201, 376; spoke of S. Hilary as a man "of holy memory," 202; other references to, 12, 100, 104, 128, 130, 172, 183, 357, 359, 360, 371, 376-378, 397, 399, 411, 428, 481, 483, 512
 Leo II., S., Pope, 398
 Leo IV., Pope, 174
 Leo XIII., Pope, 164, 433
 Leontius, Bishop of Antioch, 227, 232, 233, 234, 253, 283
 Lessius, S.J., 425
Libellus, The, of Hormisdas, 398-403, 412, 413, 419; its various forms, 414-417; many Eastern bishops avoided signing it, 421-424
 Liberatus, Archdeacon of Carthage, 168
Liber Diurnus, 172
 Liberius, Pope; heroically withstood the Emperor Constantius, 135; withdrew in 357 his communion from S. Athanasius, 135, 270, 283; compromised the faith, 135, 162, 271; styled by some "*Saint Liberius*," 265; the chief share in the pacification of 362, not to be attributed to, 266-274; escaped banishment after Council of Ariminum, 271; was in 362 still out of communion with S. Athanasius, 271; rehabilitation of, by S. Athanasius, 272; his letter to the bishops of Italy, 272; Sozomen's account of the fall of, 275-287; signed an express repudiation of the *ἁμοούσιον*, 281; did not grant his communion to S. Meletius during the last year of his life, 293-295; other references to, 28, 31, 136, 230, 232-234, 259, 260, 292, 296, 297, 320, 434, 437, 484, 498
Liber Pontificalis, 38, 48, 70, 414, 520, 521
 Libosus, Bishop of Vaga, 456
 Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham: on S. Linus and S. Anencletus, 5; on the date of the Clementine romance, 49; on the variations in S. Peter's position, 114; on the influence of the Clementine romance at Rome, 444; other references to, 38, 40-46, 112, 227, 351, 371, 435, 443, 445, 459, 460, 480
 Linus, S., Pope: a monarchical bishop, 5; received episcopate from S. Peter and S. Paul, 21, 38; was first bishop of Rome, 37, 39; date of the consecration of, 38, 43, 44; other references to, 39, 45, 116, 445
 Liturgy of S. James: its interpretation of "the rock," 99
 Lockhart, Father, 28
 Lucentius, Bishop of Asculum, one of S. Leo's legates at Chalcedon, 167
 Lucianic creed, one of the creeds promulgated in 341 by the Council of Antioch, 280
 Lucifer, Bishop of Caralis in Sardinia: consecrated Paulinus to be bishop of the Eustathians at Antioch, 159, 264; fell away into schism, 159, 265; baseless theory ascribing status of a papal legate to, 267, 493-496; other references to, 235, 257, 260, 261, 263, 273, 288, 303, 352, 368, 369, 454
 Lucius, an Arian bishop of Alexandria, 336
 Lucius, Bishop of Verona, 434
 Lucius, Pope, 5
 Lugo, Cardinal de, S.J., 430
 Lumpert, 430
 Lupus, Christianus, 194, 424
 Lyons, only see in Celtic Gaul at first, 16, 55
 Maassen, 30, 139, 173, 185, 205, 212, 434, 499, 500
 Macedonius I., Bishop of Constantinople and heresiarch, 240, 307, 330
 Macedonius II., S., Patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 495-511), 387, 388, 390, 396, 397, 399, 400, 402, 409, 410, 412, 416, 418
 Macedonius, a *Magister officiorum*, 485
 Macedonius, Bishop of Mopsuestia, 233
 Macrina, S., the elder, S. Basil's grandmother, 238
 Macrina, S., the younger, S. Basil's sister, 238
 Magnus, an African Christian, 78, 79
 Maistre, M. de, 98, 99, 116, 118, 194
 Maldonatus, S.J., 223
 Malnory, the Abbé, 179
 Mamachi, Thomas Maria, O. Praed., 126
 Mamertus, S., of Vienne, 200
 Manning, Cardinal, 25, 111, 112, 286
 Mansi, Archbishop of Luca: on S. Cyprian's excommunication, 74, 75; other references to, 145, 164, 206, 437, 462, 496, 510, 522
 Maran, Dom, O.S.B., 67, 69, 77, 229, 240, 244, 245, 267, 276, 281, 289, 290, 294, 295, 300, 306, 308, 316, 318, 321, 322, 327, 333, 363, 430, 457, 458, 463, 468, 496

- Marca, Archbishop de, of Paris, 143, 144, 193, 200, 437, 449, 450
 Marcellian, Duke of Valeria, 515
 Marcellinus. *See under* Ammianus Marcellinus
 Marcellinus Comes, 506
 Marcellus, of Ancyra: S. Athanasius towards the end of his life withdrew his communion from, 290; died out of communion with the Roman see, 326; other references to, 141, 164, 230, 231, 233, 236, 237, 255, 259-261, 263, 279, 280, 289, 291-293, 295, 296, 307, 325, 330, 351, 378, 480, 481, 497, 498
 Marcian, Emperor, 168, 172, 202, 325, 357, 358
 Marcianus, of Arles, S. Cyprian's letter about, 55-58, 436, 450, 451
 Marcion, the heresiarch, 38, 154, 198
 Marianus (*al. Marinus* or Martinus), Bishop of Utzippara, 207-210
 Marin, The Abbé, 391
 Marinianus, Vicar of the Spains, 486
 Marinus. *See* Marianus
 Marinus, Bishop of Arles, 138, 480
 Mark, S., first Bishop of Alexandria, 10, 11, 378
 Marseilles, *see of*, 56; its quasi-metropolitan status, 149, 151
 Martialis, Bishop of Merida in Spain: deposed as a libellatic, 59; other references to, 436, 450, 452
 Martin, The Abbé, 354, 357
 Martin, S., of Tours, 152
 Martinianus, S., of Como, 405
 Martinus. *See* Marianus
 Martyrius, an Arianizing bishop, 233
 Martyrius, Bishop of Marcianopolis, 335
 Martyrology, The Roman, 68, 166, 202, 287, 327, 367, 386, 387, 390-395, 418
 Mason, Dr., 62
 Massuet, Dom, O.S.B., 20, 25, 39, 437
 Mattes, 458
 Matthias, S., the election of, to the apostolate, S. Chrysostom's view of S. Peter's position in connexion with, 372-375
 Mauritania Tingitana, 149
 Maximin, S., of Trier, 230
 Maximinus, a Vicar of Rome, 517
 Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, 130
 Maximus, Bishop of the Carthaginian Novatianists, 447
 Maximus, the Cynic: chronology of events connected with his history, 529-540; his proceedings before coming to Italy, 529, 530; other references to, 380, 541
 Maximus, Emperor, 367, 486
 Maximus, S., Bishop of Jerusalem, 130, 237
 Mayor, Dr. J. B., 477
 McCloskey, Cardinal, 286
 Meaux, Council of (A.D. 845), 93
 Meindaerts, Peter John, Archbishop of Utrecht, 332
 Meletius, S., Bishop of Antioch: was at one time Bishop of Sebaste, 158; was appointed Bishop of Antioch, 158; professed Catholic faith in the presence of Constantius, 159; falsely accused of being an Arian, 160; was supported by S. Basil and all the Eastern saints, 160; presided over the second Ecumenical Council, 165; died during the council out of communion with Rome, 165, 350, 353, 502, 503; was canonized at once, 166; was probably consecrated bishop in 357 at Council of Melitene, 241-244; was never a Homoean, 245; his orthodoxy discussed, 247-255; his sermon before Constantius, 254, 255; his history during the reigns of Jovian and Valens, 288-328; accepted Nicene creed and terminology in 363 at Council of Antioch, 291-293; was never admitted to communion by Liberius, 293-295; his second and third exiles, 302; his claim rejected by Damasus, 319; stigmatized at Rome as an Ariomaniac, 320, 327; "the most admirable bishop of the true Church of God," 321; one of the decrees of the Roman Council of 380 was directed against, 332-334; the compact of, with Paulinus, 340, 346, 347; other references to, 161-164, 227, 228, 235, 238, 246, 256-259, 261-265, 329, 330, 332, 337-339, 341-345, 348-352, 362-370, 383, 389, 406, 496-499, 501, 502, 504, 505, 537, 541
 Melitene, Council of (A.D. 357), 237, 238, 241, 243, 244, 296
 Mennas, S., Patriarch of Constantinople: anathematized Pope Vigilius, 404; other references to, 397, 402, 417
 Merenda, Antonius Maria, 145, 278, 279, 294, 297, 305, 306, 308, 315-319, 321, 325, 330, 331, 333, 337, 338, 341, 342, 488, 501-504, 510, 511, 513, 519, 528
 Metropolitans, authority of, 6-8; origin of, 7; there were none, except the pope, in the suburbicarian regions, 147, 148; the establishment of, in the West, 148, 149, 450; are not mentioned in the Latin edition of the Sardican canons, 153

- Meurin, Bishop, 115
 Meyer, Guilelmus, 144, 510-513
 Milan, Church of: the date of its bishop becoming a metropolitan, 148, 151, 434, 485; in the time of S. Ambrose and his immediate successors it shared with the Roman Church the hegemony of the West, 540; other references to, 58, 113
 Milan, Councils of: (A.D. 345), 233, 234, 247; (A.D. 355), 484; (May or June, 381), 344-346, 529-538, 541; (December, 381), 204, 380, 531-539, 541; (April, 382), 204, 380, 539, 542
 Mileum, Council of (A.D. 416), 206, 207
 Miltiades, S., Pope, 152
 Misenus, Bishop of Cumae, 378, 383, 384, 396, 410, 416
 Missal, Roman, its interpretation of "the rock," 99
 Moberly, Bishop, of Salisbury, on "Feed My sheep," 119
 Möhler, Joannes Adamus: on the origin of metropolitans, 7; other references to, 13, 430
 Mommsen, Theodor, 30, 287, 361, 414, 441, 520
 Mongus, Peter. *See* Peter Mongus
 Montalembert, M. de, on the pagan corruption which invaded the Church in the fourth century, 131-133
 Montfaucon, Dom, O.S.B., 159, 260, 263, 293, 363, 370, 496, 511
Month, The, 350
 Montreuil, 173
 Morcelli, S. J., 205, 207-209
 Morin, Dom Germain, O.S.B., 520
 Moschus, John, 393
 Mozley, Dr. J. B., 433
 Murray, Dr., of Maynooth, on the promise to S. Peter, 98
 Najrân, The 3911 Martyrs of, 389, 394, 396
 Natalis Alexander, O. P., 74, 75, 77, 141, 378, 422, 423, 430, 493, 494
 Natalis, Bishop of Oëa, 456
 Neale, Dr., 6, 332, 391, 418, 461
 Nectarius, Bishop of Avignon, 201
 Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, 165, 335, 349, 354, 380, 505, 531, 534-536, 538-541
 Neoterius, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 527
 Nepotianus, a priest, 134
 Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, the heresiarch, 376, 399, 411, 412, 419, 428, 479
 Newman, Cardinal: on the meaning of *convenire ad*, 25; describes the state of Christendom in 360 and 361...239; on the Church of Alexandria as "the arbiter of doctrine" in the time of Julian, 265; on the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra, 480, 481; other references to, 28, 68, 137, 138, 159, 216, 236, 237, 247, 255, 258, 263, 280, 281, 333, 351, 429, 437, 453, 506, 508
 Nicaea, First Council of (A.D. 325), first Ecumenical: was convoked by the Emperor, 137, 169, 477-480; its president was Hosius, 137; Hosius presided at, not as papal legate, 169-172; its fifth canon, 139, 140, 190, 523; set the seal of its approval on that system of Church government for which the Church of England contends, 140; its sixth canon, 138, 139, 382, 480; recognizes no primacy of ecumenical jurisdiction in Roman Church, 139; dispute as to whether Sardican canons are to be attributed to, 184-193; correct copies of canons of, sent in 419 to Carthage, 188; other references to, 17, 62, 130, 137-140, 141, 144, 153, 166, 167, 174, 192, 204, 235, 236, 239, 255, 260, 268, 272, 273, 279, 291, 292, 295, 296, 299, 300, 317, 334, 350, 351, 355-361, 376, 381, 416, 426, 427, 430, 431, 434, 438, 453, 497, 498
 Nicaea, Second Council of (A.D. 787), 251, 267, 269
 Nicephorus, acolyte, 5
 Nicephorus Callisti, the Church historian, 385, 437
 Nicholas de Lyra, 442
 Nicholas I., Pope, 175, 177, 225, 437, 500
 Nicole, Pierre, on the excommunication of Acacius, 385, 386
 Nieuwenhuisen, Michael van, Archbishop of Utrecht, 332
 Novatian, an anti-pope, 51, 56, 467; passages about, in S. Cyprian's letters, explained, 78-85
 Novatus or Navatus, Bishop of Sitifis, 185
 Octavianus, S., of Como, 405
 Oehler, Franciscus, 39
 Onesimus, appointed by Acacius of Caesarea to the see of Nicomedia, 246
 Optatus, an African bishop, probably of the Proconsular province, 207, 210
 Optatus, S., of Mileum, 29, 100, 465
 Optimus, Bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, 335
 Origen, 482
 Orsi, Cardinal, description of second Ecumenical Council by, 165
 Otreius, Bishop of Melitene, 335

- Pagi, Father, 145, 170, 395, 422, 423, 437, 510, 525
- Palafox, Juan de, 332
- Palatinus, Bishop of Bosa or Bossa, 206, 207
- Palladius, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch (A. D. 488-498), 385, 387
- Palmer, Sir W., 433
- Palmieri, Dominico, S. J., 222
- Pantaleon, S., and his eight companions, 389, 395
- Paschal controversy, 14-19, 224, 225, 436-438
- Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybaeum, chief papal legate at Chalcedon, 168, 169, 202
- Paschasius, an agent of the anti-pope Ursinus, 520
- Passeratus, 39
- Paternus, Bishop of Perigueux, 258
- Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, 152
- Paul, S., the Apostle: an apostolic founder of the Roman Church, 12, 13, 19, 21, 37, 44; martyred at Rome, 12, 13; an apostolic founder of the Church of Ephesus, 22; was never Bishop of Rome, 40; his work ignored by the Clementine romance, 42, 43; his real work at Rome, 43, 44; chronology of his life, 43; covertly attacked in the Clementine romance, 48; comparison of, with S. Peter, 92; puts S. James before S. Peter, when enumerating the pillar-apostles, 111, 112; probably recognizes S. Peter's primacy of order in 1 Cor. ix. 5, 111; his rebuke of S. Peter at Antioch, 116; his tone of independence, 116
- Paul, Patriarch of Alexandria, 402
- Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, a heresiarch, 68, 255, 275-277, 279, 280, 282, 380, 481
- Paulianists, 453
- Paulinus, the biographer of S. Ambrose, 253
- Paulinus, Eustathian bishop of Antioch; consecrated by the firebrand, Lucifer, 159, 264, 352; acknowledged in 375 by Damasus as the true Bishop of Antioch, 160; rejected by S. Basil and the Eastern saints, 160; used the formula of the *One Hypostasis*, 161; admitted in 346 to the communion of S. Athanasius, 234; from September 362 to September 363, probably not in communion with S. Athanasius, 234, 288-290; generally regarded in the East as a schismatic, 318; his compact with S. Meletius, 340, 346, 347; date of his death, 367; other references to, 158, 162, 165, 176, 228, 247, 249, 250, 252, 256, 257, 260, 261, 263, 288-290, 293, 297, 299, 301, 303, 304, 306, 309-326, 329, 330, 332-334, 337-339, 341, 342, 344, 348, 353, 362, 363, 365, 368-370, 406, 496-498, 500-505, 508, 522, 537, 539, 541
- Paulinus, S., of Nola, 48
- Paulinus, Bishop of Tyre, 227
- Pearson, Bishop, 70, 440, 442, 458, 471
- Pelagius, the heresiarch, 184, 491
- Pelagius, S., of Laodicea in Syria, 160, 165, 246, 247, 250, 291, 292, 301, 329, 330, 335, 498
- Pelagius I., Pope, 176, 484
- Pelagius II., Pope, 172
- Pelham, Professor, 30, 441
- Pentadius, Bishop of Carpis, 208
- Perrone, Joannes, S. J., 25, 33, 98, 99, 216, 382
- Petavius, Dionysius, S. J., 254, 255, 280, 282, 429, 430, 442, 443, 480
- Peter, S., the Apostle: an apostolic founder of the Roman Church, 12, 13, 19, 21, 37, 44; martyred at Rome, 12, 13; was never Bishop of Rome, 36-49; the theory that he was Bishop of Rome, vital to papalists, 36; that theory propagated by the Clementine romance, 42, 47; spurious epistle of, to S. James, 42; origin of the expression, "see of Peter," 44; as the first-chosen apostle, a fitting symbol of the unity of the Church Militant, 84-88, 92, 101-103, 470, 471; the nature of his primacy, 86; our Lord's words to, recorded in S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19, convey a promise, not a gift, 88; bishops are successors of, 90, 94, 123, 124; promise made by our Lord to, at Caesarea Philippi, discussed, 97-109; his precedence in confession rewarded by priority in designation, 108; his leadership in the work of founding the Church, 108, 109; his supposed primacy of jurisdiction over the other apostles disproved by Scripture, 110-116; was sent to Samaria by his brother-apostles, 110, 111; was "recognized as a pillar," 111, 112; his name placed between the names of S. James and S. John, 111-113; his speech at the Council of Jerusalem, 113, 114; obscure allusion in 1 Pet. v. 13 to his connexion with Rome, 116; meaning of Christ's pastoral charge to, 117-128; the years of, 384, 444; in what sense he is styled "unitas in multis" by S. Augustine, 472-473; teaching of Anglican divines about, 473-477
- Peter I., S., Bishop of Alexandria, 179
- Peter II., Bishop of Alexandria, 160,

- 306, 319, 321, 325, 326, 335-338, 340, 347, 529-531, 533, 534, 541
- Peter, Monophysite Metropolitan of Apamea, 392, 418, 421
- Peter, Cardinal, 212
- Peter Chrysologus, S., Bishop of Ravenna, 148
- Peter the Fuller, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch (A.D. 471-488), 384, 410-412, 416, 417, 419
- Peter Mongus, Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 477-490), 377-379, 381-385, 399, 403, 410, 411, 414, 416, 419
- Peter, S., Bishop of Sebaste, 165, 238, 318
- Peters, Dr., 451
- Petronius, a priest, 317
- Peyron, Amadeus, 500
- Philagrius, Prefect of Egypt, 233
- Philemon, a Roman priest, 70, 461
- Philip, Emperor, 55, 450
- Philip, legate in 419 at Carthage, and in 431 at Ephesus, 168, 182, 184, 185
- Philippopolis, Council of (A.D. 343), 185, 230-233, 238
- Phillips, Mr. Sadler, 25
- Philomelium, Church of, 16
- Philostorgius, an Arian historian, 227, 242, 246
- Philoxenus, one of S. Julius' legates at Sardica, 171
- Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, a heresiarch, 233, 234, 275, 279, 280, 325
- Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 173, 176, 177, 295
- Pitra, Cardinal, 391, 404, 432
- Pius I., S., Pope, 15, 37, 38
- Pius VII., Pope, 28
- Pius IX., Pope, 3, 34, 115, 251, 371, 431, 433
- Polycarp, S., Bishop of Smyrna, 10, 15, 21, 23, 32, 35, 40, 45
- Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, 15-18, 225
- Pompeianus, an Antiochene, the father of Evagrius, 304
- Pompeius, Bishop of Sabrata, 5, 64, 456, 466
- Pontius, S., the biographer of S. Cyprian, 70
- Pope, jurisdiction of the, as defined by Vatican Council, 3, 4; had in early times primacy of honour and influence, 14; decision of, in a matter outside his jurisdiction, had no binding force, 61; was practically bishop of bishops in Italy, 65; his primacy regarded by Bellarmine as "the principal matter of Christianity," 98; in the fourth and fifth centuries was the only metropolitan in the suburbicarian regions, 139, 148; powers of, enlarged by the legislation of Valentinian I. and Gratian, 151, 153, 154; that legislation, so far as it was received, made the popes to be Patriarchs over the West, 154, 155; was spokesman of West in dealing with East, 155; how regarded by S. Basil, 164, 165; was able to enforce his authority by the help of the civil magistrates, 178; was left free by the imperial constitutions to make and enforce his own law, 180; the nature and origin of his various kinds of power, 180, 181; was not the necessary centre of communion, 224-406; may be called "head" in two senses, 221. *See also under Rome, Church of*
- Possidius, S., Bishop of Calama, 491
- Potitus, a Vicar of Rome, 517
- Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury: on S. Peter's primacy, 474, 475; other reference to, 476
- Praetextatus, an African bishop, of the Proconsular province, 210
- Praetextatus, Vettius Agorius, 133, 136, 517, 527
- Primasius, Bishop of Adrumetum, 442
- Principalitas*, meaning of, 29-32, 51, 102, 441-442
- Principius, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 527
- Pricillian, the heresiarch, 485
- Pritannius, Bishop of Trier, 483. *See also Britonius*
- Privatus, of Lambesis, a bishop excommunicated for heresy, 51, 447, 448, 449, 461
- Probus, Sextus Petronius, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 526, 527
- Proclus, S., Bishop of Constantinople, 354
- Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles: treated Pope Zosimus' summons with contempt, 152; other references to, 149, 196
- Prophets, the second degree in the ministry in the apostolic age, 106, 107
- Prosper, S., of Aquitaine, 331
- Protasius, Bishop of Milan, 434
- Proterius, S., Bishop of Alexandria, 428
- Protogenes, Bishop of Sardica, 171
- Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, 48, 181
- Pulcheria, Empress, 167
- Puppianus, Florentius, 93
- Pusey, Dr., 62, 108, 440, 476
- Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos*, the Ursinian preface to the Luciferian *Libellus precum*, 283, 286, 517

- Quien, Le, Père, O.P., 244, 257, 295
 Quintus, Bishop of Buruc in Mauritania, 91, 459, 469
- Rade, 514, 515
 Ramsay, Professor, 32, 116, 443
 Rattray, Bishop of Dunkeld, 249
 Rauschen, Dr. Gerhard, 328, 334, 337, 486, 502, 508, 514, 517, 525, 527, 530
 Ravenna, the see of, became metropolitanical in fifth century, 148
 Ravennius, a priest, afterwards Bishop of Arles, 201
Rebaptismate, De, author of the treatise, 62; his nationality, 453
Recognitions, Clementine, 41, 48, 443, 444
Refutatio Hypocrisis Meletii, 291, 293, 496
 Reparatus, Bishop of Carthage, excommunicated Pope Vigilius, 404
 Reserve, The principle of, thoroughly understood by the primitive saints, 255
Revue Biblique, 28, 43
Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses, 425, 470
Revue des questions historiques, 2, 7, 445
 Rhodon, 32
 Richard of S. Victor, 442
 Richardson, Mr.: attempts a reply to the Fathers of Chalcedon, 13; his private canonization of Paulinus of Antioch, 367; other references to, 223, 389
 Rigault, Nicolas, 67
 Rivington, Dr. Luke: his translation of the Irenaean passage about the Roman see, 23, 24; speaks of "*Saint Liberius*" and "*Saint Lucifer*," 265; attributes the legislation of the Council of Alexandria in 362 to Liberius, 266; considers that "the whole case of S. Meletius suggests the 'Roman' theory of Church government as in full working order," 353; his mistaken notion about diptychs, 424; thinks that "the strictly papal method of government" is "taken for granted by S. Cyprian," 451; other references to, xxviii., 29, 38, 45, 47, 48, 73, 74, 86, 94, 115, 153, 166, 172, 177, 192, 204-206, 208, 211, 220, 247, 249, 254, 256, 257, 269, 286, 292-294, 306, 319, 322, 324, 325, 342, 345, 348, 349, 351, 358, 373, 375, 409, 414, 417, 423, 435, 436, 446, 448, 449, 451, 452-454, 456-458, 460, 462-464, 465, 467-469, 470, 473, 477, 478, 480, 487, 490, 493-496, 504, 508, 509, 522, 533, 540
- Robertson, Dr. Archibald, 32, 234, 236, 238, 280, 281, 288, 299, 440, 481, 497, 498, 510
 "Rock," The, of the Church: patristic interpretations of, 99-105; the commonest and the oldest opinion is that S. Peter is the, 99; the Fathers hardly ever connect the Roman see with, 99-101; the true interpretation of, 105-109
 Rogatianus, a Carthaginian deacon, 463
 Rogers, Mr. Alfred, 269
 Rohrbacher, The Abbé, 334
 Romanus, S., the Melodist, 388, 391
 Rome, Church of: the organization of the local, 5; extent of province depending on, 8, 14, 139, 434, 451; centralizing tendency in, 8; Bishop of, took precedence over other bishops, 9; reason of this precedence, 12, 13, 36; founded by S. Peter and S. Paul, 12; scene of the martyrdom of those apostles, 12; possessed their sacred relics, 13; only apostolic see in the West, 13, 178; had a primacy of honour and influence, but not of jurisdiction, 14; its witness against Gnostics, 21; why S. Irenaeus appeals primarily to its witness, 22, 33; special advantages in handing on the faith possessed by, 27, 28, 33; its *potentior principalitas*, 31-33; consulted more frequently than other apostolic sees, 32; received intelligence from all parts of the Church, 32; representatives of other churches come to, and influence, 32; its primacy attributed by some writers to S. Peter's supposed Roman episcopate, 36; sequence of early bishops of, 45; mother-church of greater part of the West, 51, 52, 82; was not regarded by S. Cyprian as "the root, the source, and the matrix of Catholic unity," 79-85, 464-469; received rich donations from the Emperors and others in the fourth and following centuries, 133; the greater part of the clergy of, perjured themselves in the time of Liberius, 135; Council of Nicaea silent about appeals to, 140; a quasi-appeal to, permitted by Council of Sardica, 142, 143; regarded in early times as the head of the West, 155, 451; from early times was consulted by Western churches, 178; appeals to, forbidden by African Church, 189, 192, 193, 448-450, 490-493; history of, from 358 to 363, very little known, 271; leadership of, is not a vital element in the Church's constitution, 274; in

- the fourth century it was normally the centre of communication and communion to all other Catholic churches, 540. *See also under* Pope Rome, Councils of: (*circa* 195), 16; (A.D. 313), 152; (A.D. 369), first under Damasus, 543; (December, 371), second under Damasus, 155, 206, 299, 300, 302, 330, 484, 543; (A.D. 374), third under Damasus, 307, 320, 330; (A.D. 376 or 377), fourth under Damasus, 326, 327, 330; (A.D. 380), fifth under Damasus, 330-334, 348; (May or June, 382), sixth under Damasus, 144-146, 155, 204, 342, 510-528, 539, 542; (autumn, 382), seventh under Damasus, 364, 365, 483, 522, 523, 536, 539, 542; (October, 449), 512; (July, 484), 379; (October, 485), 359, 381, 382, 410, 416; (A.D. 495), 383, 384, 410, 416; (A.D. 531), 157; (A.D. 743), 499; (A.D. 826), 500
- Roncaglia, Constantinus, 437
- Rossi, G. B. de, 259, 287
- Routh, Dr., 440, 442
- Rubianus, S., of Como, 405
- Rufinianus, an African bishop of the Proconsular province, 210
- Rufinianus, a bishop, to whom S. Athanasius wrote: the spuriousness of a clause interpolated into the epistle of S. Athanasius to, 269; other references to, 267, 268, 271
- Rufinus of Aquileia, 38, 48, 113, 139, 242, 248, 260, 261, 264, 265, 270, 445, 478, 480, 481
- Rufinus, prefect of the praetorium, 179
- Rufus, Bishop of Thessalonica, 157, 390, 502
- Ruinart, Dom, O.S.B., 154
- Rupert, Abbot of Deutz, 442
- Rusticus, 403
- Sabas, S., the Great, 386, 389, 393, 394, 396, 404
- Sabellius, the heresiarch, 255, 291
- Sabinus, Bishop of Leon in Spain, successor to Basilides, 59, 60, 452
- Sabinus, S., a Milanese deacon, 164, 299, 300, 302
- Sacerdos*: the usual meaning of the word in patristic literature is *Bishop*, 93
- Safrac, an Ostrogothic chief, 331, 515
- Sage, Bishop, on the *licentia* of episcopal authority, 65
- Sallustius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 385
- Salmanticenses*, The, 425
- Salmon, Dr., 42, 46, 47, 96, 440
- Salvian, on the decay of Christian morality, 132
- Sampson, S., the Receiver of strangers, 388, 390
- Sanctissimus, a priest, 305-307, 309, 315, 324, 326
- Sanday, Dr., 76, 444
- Sapor, one of Theodosius' generals, 336-340
- Sardica, Council of (A.D. 343): account of, 140-144; Hosius presided at, by nomination of the Emperor, 170, 171; the dealings of the Eastern Church with the canons of, 143, 144, 172-177; dispute at Carthage as to whether certain canons of, were really Nicene, as Pope Zosimus declared, 184-193; tried to whitewash Marcellus of Ancyra, 480; other references to, 137, 153, 154-157, 178, 196, 204, 215, 229-234, 237, 247, 259, 300, 317, 319, 352, 365, 382, 434, 481, 485, 491, 492
- Sarum Breviary, 102
- Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, 258
- Saturninus and Scipio, consulate of, 38
- Savio, Fedele, S.J., 58
- Scannell, Dr., his rendering of *convenire ad*, 25
- Scheeben's *Dogmatik*, 25
- Schelstrate, 437
- Schisma*, occasional untechnical use of the word, 489
- Secundus, Bishop of Tigisis, 152, 153
- Seeck, Otto, 525-527
- Segna, Cardinal, 39
- Seleucia, Council of (A.D. 359), 227, 237, 239, 243, 248, 250, 282
- Séméria, Padre, 28
- Sergius, a monk of Syria Secunda, 419
- Servus Dei, Bishop of Thubursicum Bure, 206, 208
- Severianus, an African bishop present in 358 at the Council of Sirmium, 275
- Severus, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch (A.D. 512-519), 387, 392, 421
- Severus, Bishop of Ravenna, 434
- Severus, Sulpicius. *See* Sulpicius Severus
- Severus, Valerius, Prefect of Rome, 520, 541
- Siburius, prefect of the praetorium of Gaul, 525
- Silvanus, Primate of Numidia, 207
- Silvanus, Bishop of Tarsus, 237, 240, 295, 296, 312, 498, 499
- Silvester, S., Pope: neither convoked the Council of Nicaea, nor presided over it, either in person or by his legates, 137, 138, 169-172, 477-480; other references to, 137, 138, 166, 376, 480
- Silvia, S., of Aquitaine, 48
- Simplicianus, S., Bishop of Milan, 58
- Simplicius, Pope, 377, 378

- Siricius, Pope, 58, 156-158, 176, 179, 181, 197, 273, 368, 371, 485, 507-509
- Sirmium, Councils of: (A.D. 351), 280; (A.D. 357), 236; (A.D. 358), 259, 275-287; (May, 359), 427
- Sirmond, Jacques, S.J., 511, 513
- Smedt, Father de, S.J., 7, 13, 240, 276, 277, 281, 437, 455-461, 463, 469
- Smyrna, Church of: an apostolic see, 10; S. Polycarp constituted its bishop by S. John, 10, 21, 41, 45; S. Irenaeus appeals to its witness against Gnostics, 21, 22, 35; other references to, 16, 39, 40
- Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, 17, 138, 171, 204, 231, 242, 243, 248, 249, 251, 262, 264, 291, 293, 295, 296, 339, 367, 372, 437, 442, 478, 497, 503-507, 512, 519, 526
- Soter, S., Pope, 15, 37
- Sozomen, the ecclesiastical historian: his account of Liberius' fall, 275-287; in what sense he was an imitator of Socrates, 506; other references to, 61, 138, 176, 231, 237, 238, 242, 243, 248, 250, 251, 259, 262, 271, 295, 296, 300, 308, 334, 365, 367, 372, 478, 484, 503-507, 512, 519, 526, 531, 539
- Spain: before A.D. 386 there were metropolitans in, 149, 485; was administered by a proconsul during the latter part of Gratian's reign, 151, 485-487
- Stephen, Bishop of Antioch; was excommunicated by Council of Sardica, 158, 230; other references to, 227, 229, 231, 232
- Stephen (Bishop or Archbishop), a friend of Dionysius Exiguus, 212, 213
- Stephen, Pope: his dealings and relations with S. Cyprian, 55-71; his "proud" and "impertinent" remarks, 64; his treatment of certain Carthaginian legates, 67; his excommunication of various churches in Asia Minor, 67, 75, 225; dwells on his see being the chair of Peter, 69; "an apostate from the communion of the unity of the Church," 69; calls S. Cyprian "a false apostle," 69, 454; is invoked as a saint by the Roman Church, 70; his martyrdom doubtful, 70, 459-460; other references to, 5, 13, 50, 121, 122, 179, 436, 450-452, 454-458, 460, 462, 463, 467, 469, 536
- Stieren, Dr. Adolphus, 39
- Stillingfleet, Bishop, 440
- Stiltinck, Joannes, S.J., 240, 250, 263, 265, 266, 267, 286, 287, 343, 493, 494, 507, 508
- Stubbs, Dr., Bishop of Oxford, 149
- Suarez, Franciscus, S.J., 425, 430
- Suicer, Johannes Casparus, 126, 503
- Sulpicius Severus, 258, 265, 479, 483, 485-487
- συνόδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, 380, 390, 421
- Suyskens, Constantinus, S.J., 77, 458
- Syagrius, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 525, 526, 528
- Syagrius, Bishop of Verona, 483
- Sylloge Centulensis*, 287
- Symeon, S., Stylites, 391, 392, 418
- Symmachus, Q. Aurelius, 526
- Symmachus, Pope, 183, 212, 271, 321, 359, 377, 409, 411, 520
- Synodicon*, 17
- Syria Secunda, The 350 martyrs of, 388, 392, 418-421
- Tablet, The*, 433
- Talaia, John, Patriarch of Alexandria, 377, 378
- Tall brothers, their appeal to S. Chrysostom, 60, 61
- Taurianus, a Macedonian bishop, 183
- Telepte, Council of (A.D. 418), 209
- Telesphorus, S., Pope, 15, 37
- Terentius, an African bishop, probably of the Proconsular province, 207, 210
- Terentius, Count, 319, 321, 322
- Terentius, Bishop of Tomi in Scythia, 335
- Tertullian: on the apostolic churches, 10, 11, 44, 435; does not regard either S. Peter or S. Paul as Bishops of Rome, 39, 40; regards S. Clement as first Bishop of Rome, 40, 45, 46; speaks ironically of Pope Callistus as "the bishop of bishops," 65; his interpretation of the promise to S. Peter, 104; on the true Vicar of Christ, 407; other references to, 47, 51, 81, 429, 444-446, 465
- Theasius, Bishop of Memblosa, 207, 209
- Theodore, of Mopsuestia, 256, 404, 405
- Theodore, Bishop of Petra, 392
- Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus, 138, 148, 204, 206, 227, 235, 237, 242, 248, 249, 264, 299, 300, 307, 337-339, 353, 354, 363, 364, 405, 441, 478, 484, 504, 505, 508, 522, 539
- Theodoric, King, 419
- Theodorus, prefect of the praetorium of Italy, 513
- Theodosian Code, 169 *et passim*
- Theodosius, S., the Coenobiarch, 388, 392, 393, 396
- Theodosius, a superior of the hermits in the desert of Chalcis, 310
- Theodosius the Great, Emperor: his

- decrees in favour of the Nicene faith, 334-336; other references to, 131, 150, 156, 165, 171, 204, 247, 331, 349, 343, 345-349, 354, 367, 371, 380, 509-512, 515, 518, 525, 526, 528, 530, 531, 534, 535, 537-542
- Theodosius the Younger, Emperor, 167, 355-357, 478, 512, 513, 525
- Theophanes, S., 388, 404
- Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, 61, 176, 179, 202, 320, 354, 367, 371, 379, 380, 428, 482, 507-509
- Theophilus, Bishop of Castabala, 295
- Theophylact, 88
- Thiel, Andreas, 361, 411
- Thionville, Council of (A.D. 844), 93
- Thomas Aquinas, S., 93, 203, 254, 255, 430
- Thomassinus, Ludovicus, 25, 453
- Tiberius II., Emperor, 173, 176
- Tillemont, 12 *et passim*; his conjectural emendation of a passage in the letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, 536, 537
- Timothy I., Bishop of Alexandria, 179, 335, 347
- Timothy the Cat, Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 457-477), 358, 383, 384, 399, 411, 416
- Timothy III., Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 520-537), 394, 395
- Timothy, Monophysite Patriarch of Constantinople, 397, 398
- Timothy, a disciple of Apollinarius, 326
- Tissot, M. Charles, 208, 209
- Tizzani, Archbishop, 469
- Toutté, Dom, O.S.B., 237, 244, 295, 363, 496
- Trench, Dr. R. C., Archbishop of Dublin, 442
- Trophimus, S., Bishop of Arles, 450
- Trullo*, Council in (A.D. 691), 143, 144, 174, 179
- Turin, Council of (A.D. 398), 58, 113, 149
- Turmel, The Abbé, 425
- Turner, Mr. C. H.: his proposed emendations of the text of passages in the Milanese letter *Sanctum animum tuum*, 532, 537; other references to, xxx., 76, 170, 171, 188
- Tutus, Bishop of the "Ecclesia Melzitana," 206, 208
- Tutus, Bishop of Misgirpa, 207, 208
- Tyana, Council of (A.D. 367), 295, 296
- Tyre, Council of (A.D. 335), 141, 229
- Tyre, Council of (A.D. 518), 359
- Ullathorne, Bishop, 432, 433
- Unam Sanctam*, The bull, 1, 2
- Undique*, meaning of, 27
- Union Review*, 65
- Unitas sacerdotalis*, meaning of, 52, 446
- Unity of the Church: Roman theory of, 216, 217; Roman theory of, contrasted with Catholic doctrine about, 217, 218; teaching of Holy Scripture about, 218-224; summary of truth about, 406-408; will ultimately be visible and perfect, 408
- Urban, a Mauritanian bishop, 522
- Urban V., Pope, 2
- Urban, Bishop of Sicca, 184, 187
- Ursacius, Arian Bishop of Singidunum, 234, 271, 275, 277, 279, 281, 284, 285, 543
- Ursacius, Bishop of Brixia, 434
- Ursinus, anti-pope, 136, 286, 303, 342, 514-522, 538, 541
- Ussher, Archbishop, 442
- Vaison, Council of (A.D. 442), 48
- Valence, Council of (A.D. 374), 197
- Valens, Arian Bishop of Mursa, 230, 234, 271, 275, 277, 279, 281, 284, 285, 543
- Valens, Emperor, 165, 256, 292, 294, 296, 297, 302, 306, 307, 310, 328, 329, 351, 353, 495, 510, 512, 518, 524, 528
- Valens, Julius, Arian Bishop of Pettau, 514, 515
- Valentia, Gregory de, S.J., 430
- Valentinian I., Emperor, 133, 144, 145, 147-151, 153-157, 178, 195, 294, 299, 303, 306, 307, 338, 487, 512, 517, 522
- Valentinian II., Emperor, 145, 340, 486, 487, 510-513, 515, 521-525
- Valentinian III., Emperor: murdered Aetius, 200; enlarged by a rescript the State-given jurisdiction of the Roman see, 200, 201; this rescript of, a new starting-point in the development of papal claims, 202; other references to, 376, 479, 512
- Valentinus, Primate of Numidia, 185, 206, 207, 376
- Valerian, Emperor, 70, 459
- Valerian, S., Bishop of Aquileia, 300, 302, 364, 482-484
- Valerius Severus, Prefect of Rome, 342
- Vallarsi, Dominico, 162, 304, 343
- Valois, De (Valesius), 75, 80, 170, 439, 462, 477, 531
- Van den Bosche, Petrus, S.J., 257, 330, 341, 457, 504
- Van Espen, Zeger Bernardus: on the essential equality of bishops, 6; other references to, 184, 491
- Van Papenbroeck (Papebrochius), Daniel, S.J., 494
- Vasquez, Gabriel, S.J., 436

- Vatican Council (A.D. 1869, 1870) : its teaching, 3, 4; theory set forth by, unknown in Pope Victor's time, 18; that theory contradicted by S. Cyprian, 53, 60, 63; witness of the first three centuries adverse to its theory, 72, 96; quotes "Thou art Peter" and "Feed My sheep" in support of papal supremacy, 97; its theory not held by S. Augustine, 104; other references to, 17, 34, 64-66, 115, 117, 128, 140, 143, 187, 188, 194, 199, 202, 215-218, 322, 323, 365, 406, 433, 494
- Vaughan, Dr., Dean of Llandaff, 442
- Venables, Edmund, Canon of Lincoln, 138
- Venerius, S., Bishop of Milan, 481, 482
- Vercellae, the so-called "archives of," 494-495
- Verhoven, Franciscus, S.J., 390
- Victor, Bishop of Abdera, 207
- Victor, Bishop of Misgirpa, 208
- Victor, Bishop of Pappianum, 207
- Victor, Pope : separated Asians from *his own* communion, 18; *endeavoured* to separate them from the Catholic communion, but failed, 18; other references to, 13, 15-19, 31, 47, 75, 224, 225, 436, 437, 463
- Victor. *See* Vito
- Victorinus, Marius, 278, 279
- Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, 179
- Vigilius, Pope : anathematized by S. Mennas, 404; confessed to S. Eutychius that the devil had deceived him, 405; other references to, 171, 330, 361, 404
- Vincent, S., of Lerins, 427, 431
- Vincentius, Bishop of Capua, 137, 138, 170, 171, 271
- Vincentius, Bishop of the "Ecclesia Culusitana," 207, 209, 210
- Vitalian, *Magister militum* of Thrace, 415
- Vitalis, a priest at Antioch : became in 374 an Apollinarian, 160; was consecrated in 376 to be the Apollinarian bishop at Antioch, 160, 308; other references to, 161, 162, 252, 309, 311-319, 324, 337
- Vitalis, Bishop of Truentum, 378
- Vito (or Victor), legate of Pope S. Silvester at Nicene Council, 137, 138, 170, 171
- Viventius, Prefect of Rome, 517
- Voël, Guillaume, 173, 176
- Volventius, Proconsul of Spain (A.D. 382), 485
- Vulgate, meaning of *convenire ad in*, 26
- Waterworth, 25
- Watson, Mr. E. W., 451, 458, 464
- Westcott, Dr. B. F., Bishop of Durham, 110, 442
- Western Empire, principal divisions of, during reigns of Valentinian I. and Gratian, 150, 151
- White, Mr. H. J., 500
- Wilberforce, R. I., 25, 55
- Williams, Mr. George, 418
- Wiseman, Cardinal : makes communion with Rome to be the test of membership in the Catholic Church, 216, 225, 323, 406; asserts that this theory is taught by the Fathers, 216, 224, 323, 405; other references to, 226, 227, 350, 365, 366, 372, 394, 396, 406
- Wordsworth, Dr. Christopher, Bishop of Lincoln, 131
- Xystus I., S., Pope, 15, 37
- Xystus II., S., Pope, 70, 71, 74, 459, 460, 462
- Xystus III., S., Pope, 181, 427, 428
- Zaccagni, Laurentius Alexander, prefect of the Vatican library, 325
- Zaccaria, Franciscus Antonius, S.J., 161, 250, 363, 429
- Zacchaeus, 443
- Zacharias, Pope, 499
- Zahn, Dr. Theodor, 49, 443
- Zeno, Bishop of Tyre, 498
- Zeno, Emperor, 377, 414
- Zeno, S., Bishop of Verona, 429
- Zerta, Council of (A.D. 412), 207
- Zigabenus, Euthymius. *See* Euthymius Zigabenus
- Zoilus, Bishop of Larissa in Syria, 291
- Zosimas, S., the Wonder-worker, 389, 393
- Zosimus, Bishop of Tharassa, 456
- Zosimus, Pope, 152, 167, 168, 182, 184-188, 196, 197, 335, 491, 492

THE END.

BW921 .P98

The primitive saints and the see of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00065 4931